

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1887.

SCHEME FOR A CATALOGUE OF GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICAL MANUSCRIPTS.

IN accordance with a suggestion made in a former number of the *Classical Review* (pp. 38 foll.), it is proposed to print from time to time brief descriptions of the Classical MSS. in Greek and Latin which exist in public and private libraries, at home in the first instance, and (possibly) also abroad. By this means useful material for reference will be brought together, and in the end a fairly complete catalogue may be formed. The success of the scheme must, however, depend entirely upon co-operation. It is proposed to commence with the MSS. of Greek poets, keeping as far as possible to the chronological order, and the Editor would be glad to receive (1) information as to the existence of such MSS. from librarians and others, (2) names of persons who would be willing to assist in drawing up the descriptive catalogue. The scheme which follows, together with the (imaginary) examples by which it is illustrated, was drawn up by Mr. E. Maunde Thompson, and has received the approval of some of the best English palaeographers. Information under all the heads which are here laid down cannot of course be expected in every instance; but it is hoped that they are exact and wide enough to take in all the points that need to be recorded—

Form of Descriptions.

General description of the MS. :

State (1) the number or designation of the MS.; (2) the material on which it is written; (3) the number of leaves, and of columns (if two or more); (4) the measurement of the leaves; (5) the character of the writing; (6) the date or period, and, if possible, where written; (7) the history of the MS. and names of former owners. Note anything of external interest, as binding, &c.

NO. VIII. VOL. I.

Description of contents :

If a Greek MS., the titles to be in Greek (*not* Latin).

If a Latin MS., the titles to be in Latin.

If titles are given in the MS., quote them between inverted commas.

If the MS. contains more than one poem or treatise, give the reference to the leaf of the MS. on which each begins, and, if it is imperfect, state where it begins or ends.

The recto side of a leaf to be indicated by the number simply, as f. 60.

The verso side, by the number and letter *b*, as f. 60 *b*.

Bibliography.

Reference to any particular feature, such as the existence of scholia or annotations, corrections, lacunae, &c., to follow.

At the end describe briefly any special ornamentation.

Examples.

LUCIAN.

BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 0000. Vellum; ff. 134. 12 x 8½ inches. Minuscules, above the ruled lines. — x cent.

Belonged, in 15th cent. to Jo. Chalceophylus of Constantinople; afterwards to Antonius Serapandus (*ob.* 1539), Jan de Witt (*circa.* 1700), Jan van der Mark of Utrecht, and John Bridges. Purchased by Lord Harley, 1726.

Bound in boards covered with stamped leather.

1. ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῇ προσαγορεύσει πταίσματος.
f. 1.

Imperf.; begins in § 8.

2. "ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῶι συνόντων."
f. 2.

3. "ἁρμονίδης." f. 6 *b*.

Imperf.; ends in § 2.

[and so on through the vol.]

Collations in ed. Hemsterhuis, 1743-46. Cod E. in Fritsch's ed. 1860-74. See Cat. Anc. MSS.

Two quires are lost after f. 64. Scholia in the margins in half-uncials.

Very handsome initial letters in gold and colours.

VIRGIL.

BRIT. MUS., Add. MS. 00000. Vellum; ff. 150, in double columns. $6 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Lombardic minuscules. Written in Italy; A.D. 1194.

Belonged, in 14th cent. to St. Augustine's monastery, Canterbury; and in 1800 to Thomas Crane, minister of St. Olave, Chester. See Cat. Add. MSS.

1. Bucolica. f. 4.
2. "Georgica"; with arguments attributed to Ovid. f. 13 b.

3. Æneis; with arguments, &c. f. 38.

Copious scholia and glosses, the greater part contemporary, the remainder in French and English hands of various dates down to the fifteenth century. Three quires (or twenty-four leaves) are lost from the beginning of the volume, the quire signatures now beginning with sig. iv. A cutting, containing a miniature, from a French MS. of the thirteenth century, has been inserted at the beginning.

WEIL'S DEMOSTHENES.

Les Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène.
Par HENRI WEIL. Deuxième Série.
Androtion, Aristocrate, Timocrate, Aristogiton. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}. 1886. 8 fr.

THOSE who are acquainted with the two preceding volumes of Weil's *Demosthenes* (published respectively in 1873 and 1887) will welcome this latest instalment of so important a work. Weil stands among the foremost of Greek scholars in France. He is conspicuous for good sense and sobriety as a commentator, for a wide historical knowledge, and for an admirable literary judgment. His Introductions exhibit the oratorical structure of the speeches and the occasions which called them forth with singular penetration and insight. He is familiar with the most recent researches in the departments of archaeology and law, and his pages embody these results without being overweighted by detail.

The critical notes appended to the text include a new and valuable collation of the Parisian manuscript S. Weil, while appreciating the clear superiority of S over all other MSS., does not follow it with the blind devotion of the Zurich editors. But it seems to be rather sound commonsense than a delicate and sympathetic comprehension of the language or a thorough mastery of its idioms that guides him aright. When we look for critical or grammatical elucidation we become aware that his strength lies in other directions. The niceties of syntax and the finer shades of meaning either escape him or fail to interest him. In scholarly exactness and completeness his notes generally fall behind those of Wayte in his very useful edition of the *Androtion* and *Timocrates* (Cambridge University Press,

1882). We might instance *Androtion*, § 3 (παρὰ μικρόν), *Timocr.* § 195 (οὐδ' ὀλίγον δεῖ), *Timocr.* § 196 (πολλόστῳ χρόνῳ), *Timocr.* § 39 (εἰ with subjunctive in a legal document). In questions affecting the text it is almost part of Weil's manner not to give the reasons which determine his critical judgment. We desire to see the process and he only gives us the conclusion. Thus it happens that he sacrifices thoroughness to studied brevity, as in *Aristocr.* § 165, τὸν μὲν ἅπαντα χρόνον μῆνας ἐπὶ διήγαγεν ἡμᾶς πολέμων. Here S has ἡμᾶς (kept by Weil). A ἡμῖν, while Cobet (*M.C.* p. 541) would read πρὸς ἡμᾶς. It may plausibly be argued that ἡμᾶς is the mistake of a transcriber who was familiar with the late Greek phrase, πολεμεῖν τινά, whereas Demosthenes knows only πολεμεῖν τινὲς or πρὸς τινά. On the other hand διήγαγεν is sometimes used in a causative sense, e.g. in *de Cor.* § 89, ὁ πόλεμος ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν βίον ἀφθονωτέροις καὶ εὐνοτοτέροις διήγεν ἡμᾶς, 'the war kept you in a better and cheaper supply of all the necessities of life.' It is not impossible that διήγαγεν ἡμᾶς πολέμων should mean 'kept us in a state of warfare,' where πολεμοῦντας or ἐν πολέμῳ would have been the more natural expression. Reiske following *Etym. Magn.* would give διήγαγε the meaning of ἐξηπάτησε, a conjecture based presumably on the use of διαγωγῇ, 'amusement,' 'entertainment.' But διαγωγῇ belongs to διάγειν in its connection with χρόνον, 'a pastime,' and lends no support to διάγειν = ἐξαπατᾶν. Weil, however, accepts the alleged usage without stating the authority on which it rests, and without arguing the case. He merely translates 'il nous amusa en nous faisant la guerre,' and proceeds to remark on the ironical turn of the phrase.

Again, we miss some critical discussion of *Aristocr.* § 117, ταύτην ἂν ἐμοὶ χρήσθαι συμβούλῳ φυλάξετε τὴν πίστιν πρὸς τοῦτον τὸν θράκα, καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι τίνα ἂν...πρὸς ὑμᾶς σχοίη γνώμην. Weil here, like most previous editors, admits without demur an abnormal and startling bit of syntax. His note is, 'καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε equivalent to καὶ μὴ βούλεσθε.' The fut. indic. is accompanied by μὴ owing to the imperative sense of the proposition. Cf. *Aristoph. Plut.* 488, μαλακὸν δ' ἐνδώσετε μηδέν.' A reference, however, to the context of *Plutus*, 488, will show that μαλακὸν δ' ἐνδώσετε μηδέν need not be taken as an independent clause containing a direct prohibition, but forms part of a relative sentence. The relative φῖ is carried on from the preceding νικήσετε to ἐνδώσετε. Some other supposed examples of this use of μὴ may be similarly disposed of: e.g. *Soph. Ajax*, 572, μήτε...θήσουσι, where the future depends on a preceding ὅπως. No sure inference can be based on Menander, *Mon.* 572, ξένον ἀδικήσεις μηδέποτε καιρὸν λαβών, or on *Eur. Med.* 822, λέξεις δὲ μηδὲν τῶν ἐμοὶ δεδογμένων, as in each case the fut. indic. differs only from the aorist subjunct. by εἰ instead of ἦ. (Yet it must be owned that in both these instances the harshness of the fut. indic. is modified by the position of the negative following instead of preceding the verb). There remains, however, one passage which cannot be evaded or emended, *Lysias xxi.* § 13, εἰν δὲ εὖ φρονήτε, καὶ νυνὶ τοῦτο φανερόν...ποιήσετε...καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοῖς ἀδειαν δώσετε. Comparing the close resemblance between the structure of this sentence and the passage in *Aristocr.* we may perhaps be driven to accept the usage, however rare, as genuine, and to give it a place beside certain other eccentric but well-established combinations, e.g. μὴ with fut. indic. in oaths in Homer, and μὴ with opt., and ἂν in Attic prose and verse. If it were not for the quotation from *Lysias* it would be far more tempting to read βούλεσθε with Bekker in *Aristocr.* § 117.

Weil as a rule cannot be charged with a superstitious respect for MSS. authority where it is in conflict with commonsense or invariable usage. But surely in *Aristocr.* § 33, he is mistaken in reverting to the MSS. reading. The orator is here explaining the archaic word ἀποιῶν, 'to fine' (cf. Homeric ποινή) which occurs in one of the laws relating to homicide: τὸ δὲ μηδ' ἀποιῶν [λέγει] μὴ χρήματα πράττεσθαι τὰ γὰρ ἀποιῶν χρημάτων ὀνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί. Obviously in the last clause ἀποιῶν and χρήματα ought to change places, so that the clause will run,

τὰ γὰρ χρήματα ἀποιῶν ὀνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί, 'the ancients called a pecuniary penalty ἀποιῶν'; and so in fact the words are quoted by Theon, *Progym.* iv. 15. Almost all editors since Reiske have adopted this necessary correction. It is a mistaken subtlety by which Weil attempts to justify the order of the words as they stand in the MSS., 'the ancients designated money by the term (τὰ) ἀποιῶν.' The passage cited by him is not parallel, and we may safely say that no Greek ear could have tolerated this complete inversion of an every-day phrase.

A clause in *Timocr.* § 42 has been needlessly debated and frequently misunderstood owing to the neglect of a simple idiom. [Διοκλῆς εἶπε] τοῖς μετ' Εὐκλείδην τεθέντας [νόμοις] καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τιθεμένων κυρίους εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἕκαστος ἐτέθη πλὴν εἰ τῷ προσγεγραπταὶ χρόνος ὅττινα δεῖ ἄρχειν. The sense obviously is '[Diocles moved] that the laws which were passed after Eucleides and such as are hereafter passed, shall come into force from the day on which each was passed, except where a time has been expressly specified, at which the law is to come into operation.' But doubts have been raised as to the construction of ὅττινα δεῖ ἄρχειν. Wayte is clearly right in dismissing the interpretation (adopted even by C. R. Kennedy), 'in whose archonship a law is to commence,' according to which ἄρχειν = ἄρχοντα εἶναι, and ὅττινα = 'what person.' The noun to be supplied with ὅττινα is as he says χρόνον. But he himself, apparently, takes νόμον as the subject to ἄρχειν. Two objections to this at once occur: (1) the accus. ὅττινα, to mark the point of time, (2) ἄρχειν for ἀρχεσθαι, which Wayte seeks to justify. But the passages he quotes (*Thucyd.* iv. 118, and v. 19) are instances of the strict use of ἄρχειν. All difficulty disappears as soon as we recognize that ὅττινα χρόνον is subject to ἄρχειν, so that the full phrase would be ὅττινα χρόνον δεῖ ἄρχειν (τοῦ κύριον εἶναι τὸν νόμον) lit. 'what time is to mark the beginning (of the law coming into force),' i.e. 'from what time the operation of the law is to date.' For the act. voice cf. *Thucyd.* iv. 118, 6, τὴν ἐκχειρίαν εἶναι ἐνιαυτὸν, ἄρχειν δὲ τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν (sc. τῆς ἐκχειρίας), 'that this day marks the beginning of (the truce)'; not 'that the truce begins this day,' which would be ἀρχεσθαι. So *Thucyd.* v. 19, 1, ἀρχεῖ δὲ τῶν σπονδῶν ἐφόρος Πλειστόλας, 'the ephorality of Pleistolas marks the date of the treaty.' The day from which a law or treaty dates is strictly said ἄρχειν, with a gen. of the object, 'to initiate it,' 'to mark its commencement.' Weil rightly explains

the clause in the *Timocrates* but with a brevity which is tantalizing. A good comment on the construction is supplied by Demosthenes himself in the next section, where he quotes with a slight variation the words of the law: *κελεύει γὰρ ἕκαστον ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἐτέθη κύριον εἶναι, πλὴν εἰ τῷ χρόνῳ προσγέγραπται, τοῦτω δὲ τὸν γεγραμμένον ἄρχειν*, '...except where a time has been expressly specified, and in the case of such a law the specified time is to begin it,' i.e. is to mark the date at which it comes into operation. The last clause is in itself decisive against some of the false interpretations.

Aristocr. § 96 furnishes us with an instructive variety of the conditional sentence, one however which the editors pass over in silence. The instances in prose of the past ind. with *ἂν* to denote not what would have happened under imaginary conditions, but what must have happened under actual conditions, are sufficiently rare to claim attention. The passage referred to runs thus: *οἷον εἴ τι τῶν ἡλωκότων ψηφισμάτων παρ' ὑμῖν μὴ ἐγράφη, κύριον ἂν δῆπουθεν ἦν· καὶ μὴν παρὰ τοῖς νόμοις γ' ἂν εἴρητο*. Whereas the clause *κύριον ἂν ἦν* is an ordinary unfulfilled condition, 'would have been still in force,' the clause *παρὰ τοῖς νόμοις γ' ἂν εἴρητο* is not an unfulfilled condition; for, as the immediate context shows, the illegal decrees had actually been carried. The literal rendering is 'and yet *ex hypothesi* (*ἂν*) it had been moved contrary to law.'

Repeated negatives in Greek sometimes give rise to puzzling questions, but in *Timocr.* § 28 there is no possible reason for hesitation: *ἵνα μὴ προαισθημένον μηδενὸς...τεθείη...ὁ νόμος*. Madvig would omit *μὴ* on the ground that it would negative *τεθείη*. Wayte does not pronounce definitely upon the point. Weil keeps *μὴ* but does not defend or illustrate it. Yet *μὴ* reinforced by *μηδενὸς* merely conforms to the general principle which governs repeated negatives, namely, that accumulated negatives in Greek do not cancel one another so long as the added negative adds a new idea. The double negative with the participle here is precisely similar to *Timocr.* § 46, *οὐ προτεθέντος οὐδένοιο περὶ τούτων*. Nothing could be more regular. A real irregularity, on the other hand, occurs in *Androt.* § 32 (where neither Weil nor Wayte has a note), *οὐδ' ἂν ὦσιν ἔτ' Ἀνδρότιωνός τις αἰσχρὸν βεβιωκότας οὐκ ἔστι λέγειν κακῶς τοὺς ἄρχοντας*. Here *οὐκ* following *οὐδὲ* merely repeats instead of cancelling the negative idea. So too in *Mid.* § 129, *Against Phormio*, § 2. In each of these cases, however, the protasis of a conditional

sentence intervenes between the *οὐδὲ* and the *οὐκ*, a fact which accounts for the resumption of the negative. *A propos* of negatives, it is worth referring to the construction of *τοῦ* with infin. in a final sense, where the omission of the negative is as rare and exceptional in Classical Greek as it is characteristic of Hellenistic usage. The editors do not mark the distinction. On *Timocr.* § 36, *ἐκιδέναι κελεύει τοῦ προεἰδέναι πάντας*, Weil's note is, 'genitive marking the motive cf. *de Cor.* § 107, *ἀναλῶσαι τοῦ μὴ τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖν ἐθέλειν*.' It would be more to the point to quote *Timocr.* § 133, *ἐπιβουλεύων τοῦ πιστευθῆναι*, *Steph. I.* § 41, *τοῦ βεβαίαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν εἶναι*.

The study of inscriptions has thrown new light on many documents of disputed authenticity which are inserted in the text of Demosthenes, and Weil has made good use of this important aid. In the law quoted, *Timocr.* § 33, the name *πρόεδροι* is applied to the Presidents of the board of the *Nomothetae*. This had been held to be a forger's blunder. The *πρόεδροι*, it was said, presided only over the Ecclesia, while the *Nomothetae* were presided over by the *Thesmothetae*. But an inscription published by Koumanoudis in *Ἀθήναιον* (1876, p. 179) dispels all doubts, and proves that the *Nomothetae* had their own *πρόεδροι* and their own *ἐπιστάτης*. The inscription which is of the age of Demosthenes is a decree conferring the right of citizenship on a certain Peisitheides of Delos. It concludes thus: *ἐν δὲ τοῖς νομοθέταις τ[οὺς προέ]δρους οἱ ἂν προεδρεύουσιν [καὶ τὸν ἐ]πιστάτην προσνομοθετεῖν*... Another and more famous document that has been rejected is the Oath of the Heliasts as handed down to us in *Timocr.* § 149. It would be too much to say that the document as a whole is now placed beyond suspicion; but, at least, many of the grounds on which it has been rejected are seen to be wholly inadequate; nay, it so happens that one of the suspected clauses of the oath has been strikingly corroborated by an inscription of Calymnia, now in the British Museum, published by C. T. Newton in 1883 (*Gk. Inscr. in B. M.* vol. ii. no. 290. See also *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, March 1886). The clause is this: *οὐδὲ δῶρα δέξομαι τῆς ἡλιάσεως ἕνεκα οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐτ' ἄλλος ἐμοὶ οὐτ' ἄλλη εἰδότος ἐμοῦ οὐτε τέχνη οὐτε μηχανῇ οὐδεμίᾳ*. The oath of the judges of Cnidus contained in the inscription above mentioned is couched in almost identical terms: *οὐδὲ δῶρα ἔλαβον τῆς δίκας ἐνεκεν οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐτε ἄλλος οὐτε ἄλλα ἐμ[ὴν] οὐ μηχανῇ οὐδεμίᾳ*. On the whole it seems likely that epigraphic science will undo much

of the hasty work of destructive criticism here as in other fields of inquiry. Classical antiquity is still being reconstructed; and every day we have opportunity of observing how preposterous it is to argue from our own ignorance about certain constitutional usages or legal formulae to their non-existence. Nothing is easier and nothing is more unscientific than to introduce an ignorant forger, as a *deus ex machina*, to save us from some conclusion forced upon us by our own defective knowledge. The legal documents inserted in the text of Demosthenes have been too often dealt with in this fashion, and examples might be multiplied in which the very phrase impugned turns out to be a mark of authenticity. Not a few of these documents when read in the light of inscriptions are likely to hold their place as authentic records of the fourth century, B.C.

Quite of another kind is the question of authenticity raised by the speech *Against Aristogeiton I.* (The speech *Against Aristogeiton II.* is given up by all competent critics). Here we have a problem which must be decided mainly upon literary grounds, and the most recent critics are so entirely at variance as to the character and merits of the speech that scholarship might well be inclined to despair of its task. Dionysius of Halicarnassus pronounced the speech not to be the work of Demosthenes; later writers, such as Hermogenes, Photius, Pliny the Younger, reversed that decision. Modern scholars have been almost unanimous in rejecting the speech. Dobree, Westermann, Arnold Schaefer, are here agreed. Blass, too, in his *Attische Bereds.* iii. p. 361-3 denies that it can be the work of Demosthenes, or even of a writer contemporary with Demosthenes. Nor, he thinks, can the speech have been made in a real law-case. We learn, however, with no small surprise from Weil that Blass in a private letter to him has now recanted this view, and is of opinion that the speech cannot be ascribed to any other than Demosthenes, but that it was a mere exercise or *μελέτη*, never delivered, and not intended for publication. And as Blass is thus pitted against himself, so is Dobree against Cobet. Where Dobree is convinced that we have the declamation of a sophist, Cobet traces the hand of Hypereides. Weil, however, adduces cogent reasons against the authorship of Hypereides, and

concludes his interesting examination of the speech by attributing it to Demosthenes. But his literary sense is too just to admit of his being insensible to the startling differences which separate *Aristogeiton I.* from the normal style and manner of Demosthenes. These he explains partly on a theory of interpolations, partly by other considerations which are not without weight.

Yet after all due allowances are made, most students of Demosthenes will probably find that the total effect of the composition is essentially different from the impression left by the genuine work of the orator. This or that passage may be highly Demosthenic, worthy of Demosthenes, if not from his pen; the whole speech, it may be granted, is far above the level of the average sophist. We may even find parallels for the most audacious metaphors, the coarsest invective, the most grotesque phrases, in detached passages of the *de Corona* or of the *Falsa Legatio*. Almost all the elements that offend us here may be discovered singly elsewhere. The difference, it may be said, is merely one of degree. Yes, but such a difference may be vital and fundamental, though it is impossible to mark a given point at which the adverse conviction becomes irresistible. While we are content to argue the matter in detail, we may easily persuade ourselves that there is nothing which Demosthenes might not have written. But granting that he might have written the parts, could he have written the whole? No one can pretend to give a dogmatic answer. We cannot get beyond individual impressions, which, however strong, are incommunicable. It is one of the incidents of literary criticism, especially in dealing with ancient literature, that it has no final or rigorous test for separating genuine work from spurious. In the absence of anachronisms or of archaeological inaccuracies, such as would at once condemn a composition, the only appeal is to the trained instinct and judgment of a few—a few, however, who in course of generations become many, and whose verdict on questions of taste and literary appreciation tends to a unanimity far beyond what might have been expected. Meanwhile, among the few, Weil is one of those with whom one is most reluctant, however rarely, to differ.

S. H. BUTCHER.

CAUSERET'S RHETORIC OF CICERO.

Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron, par CHARLES CAUSERET. 8vo. 245 pp. Paris (Hachette), 1886. 4 fr.

THIS elaborate and comprehensive treatise deserves the warmest welcome from all who are interested in the study of the rhetorical works of Cicero. It supplies in the systematic form of a well-arranged manual of rhetoric an almost complete conspectus of all the technical terms used by the greatest of Roman orators in treating of those matters of rhetorical criticism on which he has still a pre-eminent right to a respectful hearing.

The Introduction (pp. 1—34) briefly reviews the rhetorical works of Cicero, states the general aim of the treatise, and gives some account of the modern literature of the subject. The first part of the treatise itself (pp. 37—80), deals with a variety of preliminary details, such as the three classes of speeches, deliberative, forensic and epideictic; the contrast between *θέσις* and *ἀντίθεσις*; and the *status causarum* with all their subdivisions. The second (pp. 81—206) treats of the five parts of rhetoric, *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *actio* and *memoria*, with the subordinate details of each. The conclusion (pp. 207—210) dwells on the difficulties encountered by Cicero in his endeavour to translate into Latin the technical terms of the Greek rhetoricians; and points out the scrupulous pains that he spent on surmounting those difficulties instead of shirking them by a mere transcription of the original, such as is not unfrequent in Quintilian, and extremely common in Latin rhetoricians of later date and of minor importance. The volume closes with a comprehensive index of Greek and Latin words, a separate index of Latin phrases, and a clearly arranged table of contents.

The author shews a wide acquaintance with the Greek and Latin writers on the subject, and occasionally intersperses his quotations from their pages with interesting and suggestive criticisms of his own. He thus presents us with more than is promised on his title-page; for, while Cicero remains 'the essential object and the centre' of his work, it may fairly claim to be what the author calls 'une étude comparative des termes de la rhétorique et de la critique

littéraire, en usage chez les Grecs et chez les Romains.'

M. Causeret appears to have used no other editions of the rhetorical works of Cicero besides those of Piderit. If he had consulted others, it might have lightened his labour in collecting illustrative references from the Greek and Roman rhetoricians; and have saved him from falling into occasional error. It is also a pity that he has not used the latest edition of Volkmann's *Rhetorik* (1885) instead of that of 1874. He might thus have avoided attributing to that writer (on page 150), views on the early history of the three kinds of style, the *genus dicendi tenue*, *grave* and *medium*, which he now no longer holds (p. 532, edition 1885); nor would he have assigned the treatise *περὶ ἐμπυρίας* to Demetrius Phalereus: the only German who has recently endeavoured to maintain that hypothesis having been conclusively refuted by one of his own countrymen (*ib.* 538). M. Causeret has carefully collected the passages in which Cicero compares the rhetoric of the schools to a peaceful pageant or the drill of the parade-ground, and the practical eloquence of public life to battle under a burning sun; further illustrations may be found in a pamphlet on the metaphors from military life in the rhetorical works of Cicero, Quintilian and Tacitus, which was probably published too late to be of use in the preparation of this part of his work (D. Wollner, Landau, 1886). He omits to notice the frequent use of illustrations from the arts of painting and sculpture in the criticism of oratorical style, which is touched upon in my edition of the *Orator*, pp. lxxiii and 5. It is quite as curious, in its way, as the modern mannerism of borrowing metaphors from painting, such as 'light and shade,' in the criticism of music; and metaphors from music, such as 'tone' and 'harmony,' in the criticism of painting.

The general value of the work is so great that it is not impaired to any serious extent by the small inaccuracies that have found their way into some of its numerous details. M. Causeret is aware that there was more than one Ernesti; as a matter of fact there were three: J. A. Ernesti, the editor of Cicero and Tacitus (1707—1781); A. W. Ernesti, his nephew, an editor of Livy (1733—1801); and J. C. T. Ernesti, the

compiler of the *lexicon technologiae Graecorum et Latinorum rhetoricae* (1756—1802). On p. 156, he rightly calls the first of these (the author of the *Clavis Ciceroniana*), *l'aîné des Ernesti*; but, on p. 14, the author of the *lexicon technologiae* is misleadingly described as *l'illustre latiniste Ernesti*, a designation which inevitably recalls the first and far the most distinguished of the three. On p. 13 we have the singular spelling *eloquutio*; on pp. 47, 48, *stylus*; on p. 175, *moestitia*. On p. 7, *sitne*? is misprinted; on pp. 9, 31, 33, the *praenomen* of Piderit is printed *Wilhem*. On p. 49 it is said that *declamatio* does not occur in the works of Cicero, whereas it is found in *pro Murena* 44, *pro Plancio* 47, and in *Tusc. Disp.* 7; the statement was probably meant to be confined to the rhetorical works alone. On p. 98, *venae*, which is sometimes coupled with *viscera* 'the heart,' is itself explained as meaning 'proprement les entrailles; d'où: les sentiments intimes de chacun, teneat oportet venas cuiusque generis, aetatis, ordinis,' de Or. i § 223; but the author might have found a better rendering in Prof. Wilkins' note: 'he must have his finger on the pulse, i.e. he must be familiar with the character.' On p. 115, *Or.* 127 only explains the use of *extenuare* in the peroration, but the word itself is not to be found there; it occurs among the figures of speech in § 137. On p. 127, *Brut.* 32 and *Or.* 175 are both of them quoted in support of the statement that, according to Cicero, the credit of being the first to introduce rhythm into prose belongs to Thrasy machus of Chalcædon, *et surtout à Isocrate*; whereas the first of these passages, which assigns the credit to Isocrates, is tacitly corrected in the second, which assigns it to Thrasy machus (cf. pp. lxx and 196 of my edition of the *Orator*). The reference to *De Or.* iii 190, on p. 131, is not really (as is implied), an instance of *fluens* being contrasted with *rhythmicus*. On p. 135 the last reference for *orbis* (*verborum*) should be *Or.* 234. In *Or.* 173, quoted on p. 139, *brevitas* is applied to syllables, not (as stated) to periods.

Acquiescere in *Or.* 199 is not a true parallel to *conquiescere* in *De Or.* iii 191; for the latter alone refers to the close of the period, while the former is applied to the audience (p. 141). To the references for *minutus* on p. 149 may be added *Or.* §§ 39, 231. In the quotation from Macrobius on p. 151, *luxuriatur* is omitted after *Symmachus*. The instance of the metaphorical use of *sanguis*, quoted as from Quintilian (x 1 § 115) on p. 157, is itself simply a quotation from the *Brutus* 283, *verum sanguinem*

deperdebat. On p. 159 *naturalis color* (*Brut.* 36) ought to be *naturalis non fucatus nitor*. On p. 161 another instance of the metaphorical use of *excelsus* may be added from *Or.* 119; on the same page the *Orator* is accidentally called a 'dialogue.' To the examples of *argutus* on p. 162, may be added *Or.* §§ 38, 39, 42, and (*argute*) 98. On pp. 174—5 *nitidus*, *incultus* and *horridus* are quoted from *Or.* 36 as applied to style; they are really there applied to paintings. On p. 175 for *impexis* read *impexa*. For the metaphorical use of *flores* (p. 180), add *Brut.* 17 § 66. On p. 181, on metaphor, prefix iii to *De Or.* 38, 156. On p. 183, *commoratio*, complete the reference to *ad Herennium* (iv 45 § 58): and, on the next page, in the account of *extenuatio*, insert *ad Her.* iv 38 § 50. Lastly, on p. 188, add *plerumque* before *convertimus* in the quotation from *Aquila Romanus*.

M. Causeret has frequent occasion to quote the Greek rhetoricians for parallels to Cicero's technical terms, and for other purposes. Most of these quotations are thoroughly to the point, but the first of them is somewhat injudicious. For the etymology of *ῥητορικὴ* we are told on p. 37 to consult the anonymous scholiast on Aphthonius (ii 8, Walz): *ῥητορικὴ εἴρηται ἡτοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥυθμῶν [ῥυθμῶν] λέγειν, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ συννηγορεῖν τῷ νόμῳ: ῥήτραν γὰρ τὸν νόμον φασὶν οἱ Δωριεῖς*. This is carefully translated into French without even a passing note of exclamation, and without a syllable of protest against the scholiast's astounding ignorance of the obvious formation of so simple a word. Again, Hermogenes (*περὶ στάσεων*, ii 138, Spengel) defines *στοχασμὸς ἀδύλον πράγματος ἔλεγχος οὐσιώδης ἀπὸ τινος φανεροῦ σημείου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὑποψίας*. But M. Causeret, in quoting this passage on p. 66, accidentally omits *οὐσιώδης*, which is expressly explained in the *scholia* (iv 210, 7, Walz), and wrongly translates *πρόσωπον* 'physiognomy' instead of 'person,'—a sense in which it is repeatedly used in the preceding pages of Hermogenes, e.g. on the previous page, *διαυρήσει τοῖνυν ὁρθῶς ὁ τὴν τε διαφορὰν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν τε προσώπων καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἐτι τὴν λεγομένην στάσιν ἐπιγνοὺς τοῦ ζητήματος* (cf. iv 211, 22 Walz). In connexion with *στάσεις*, M. Causeret might have noticed Aristotle's *ἀμφισβητήσεις* (Cope's *Introduction to the Rhetoric*, pp. 397—400).

The Greek equivalents for Latin technical terms are usually given with correctness; but, in quoting *παπαίτηρις* and *κάθαρις* as equivalents for the rhetorical figures *depre-*

catio and *purgatio*, it ought to be clearly explained that these terms are not really found in the Greek rhetoricians themselves as actual names of 'figures' (note on *Orator*, p. 147). As the Greek for *exercitatio*, it is better to accept *γυμνασία* from Aristotle than *γύμνασις* from Pollux; but *μελέτη*, as M. Causeret is aware, is in some respects better than either. As an equivalent for *eloquentia*, *λογότης*, which is found in Philo and Plutarch, should give way to some such phrase as *ἡ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις δεινότης*, which has better authority. *Oratio commentata* is rendered, on p. 46, not only by *λόγος μεμελετημένος*, which is right; but also by *περιεσκευασμένος*, which ought to be altered either into *προῤῃσκευμένος* on the analogy of Thuc. viii 66, *τὰ ῥηθισόμενα αὐτοῖς προῤῃσκεπτο*, or into *ἐσκευασμένος* and *παρεσκευασμένος* (cf. Dem. *Meid.* § 191). On pp. 17, 56, where *ὑπόθεσις* is explained 'quod est ὑπὸ τὴν θέσιν,' there is no point in the use of the accusative for the dative. In contrast to *ὑπόθεσις*, or *quaestio finita*, the regular word, as M. Causeret is careful to show, is *θέσις*, or *quaestio infinita*; and among the many instances of this contrast are Cic. *Top.* 21 § 79 and Quint. iii 5 §§ 5—7. These references are quoted in the latest edition of Liddell and Scott, s.v. *θέσις*, V 2, where however *ἄρσις* is wrongly written for *ὑπόθεσις*. As an equivalent to *verba coagmentata* on p. 126, M. Causeret gives *εὐπαγῆ*, referring to Demetrius *περὶ ἑρμηνείας* (iii 300, Spengel); but *εὐπαγής* is there used not in the required sense of 'nicely adjusted in connexion with

one another,' but of a single word that has a proper euphony in itself, being in the mean between *λείων* and *τραχύ*. The true equivalent is *συνηρμοσμένα*, cf. Dion. Hal., *de comp. verb.* 23, *τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ὀνόμασι ἐπιτηδεύεις συνηρμόσθαι*. The same author might have supplied parallels to Cicero's *conglutinatio verborum* (note on *Orator*, § 78). On p. 143, *circumscriptus* as an epithet of a period is not quite satisfactorily rendered by *συνεστραμμένος*. It might be better perhaps to resort to a phrase combined with *περιγραφὴ* in the sense found in Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium* 32, *τῷ τούτου κρότῳ καὶ τόνῳ καὶ λέξεων περιγραφαῖς καὶ συνεχείας ἀποδείξων*. On p. 155, the reference for *ἄδρός*, *ισχνός* and *μέσος*, as epithets of style, should be to p. 72 (not 71) of Johannes Siceliotus. On p. 128 the accent of *νόμος* is misplaced, and on p. 184 *ἐξουθενισμός* is twice misprinted as *ἐξουθενισμός*. Lastly, on p. 193, the rhetorical term *κλίμαξ*, which is a much more elaborate figure of speech than might be supposed from the modern application of the word, is too curtly dismissed (note on *Orator*, p. 139). Possibly, while hastening toward the close of his task, the author may have found himself compelled to forego the temptation of lingering any longer over his labours, feeling, like the poet of the Georgics, that, instead of embarking afresh on an inviting theme, it was already high time for him

To furl the sail, and turn the prow to land.

J. E. SANDYS.

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

II.

Eugippii *Vita S. Severini*, ed. Pius Knoell, Vienna, 1886. 24 Mk. 40.

THE interest of the *Vita S. Severini* is of an altogether different kind from that of the *Excerpts from S. Augustine*, and to most readers will be far higher in degree. It gives a glimpse such as is not obtained anywhere else of the state of the border provinces on the break up of the Roman Empire. Severinus spent the greater part of his active life (452—482 A.D.) in the province of Noricum Ripense. He was regarded as a sort of oracle not only by his own countrymen but by the surrounding barbarians; and among those who came to consult him

was the young Odoacer just before his descent into Italy. His tall form, clad in rough sheep-skins, had to stoop in entering the saint's cell, and he was greeted with a prophecy of his coming greatness. We see the unfortunate provincials so entirely deserted that there are scarcely troops enough among them to pursue a band of marauding banditti. They are obliged to admit the barbarians into their cities. Rugians, Heruli, Goths, Alamanni are constantly making forays into their territory, or pass through it unceremoniously, as if it were their own. The Romans fly from city to city in search of peace, but in vain. At last, in 488, a command comes from Odoacer that the population should migrate bodily into Italy, and in accordance with the wishes

of the dying saint his body is taken with them. Not long afterwards, in the papacy of Gelasius, 492—496, a sumptuous mausoleum was built for it by a wealthy lady at Castellum Lucullanum near Naples. A monastery was also founded over which first Marcianus and then Eugippius, disciples of the saint, presided. Eugippius had been for some years in the company of Severinus on the Danube, and in the year 511 he wrote, partly from his own recollections and partly from the report of his elders, a short memoir (*Commemoratorium*) of his master. He hoped that his friend Pascasius would throw this into a more literary shape, but Pascasius declined to do this, as an unnecessary task only suggested by the modesty of Eugippius. The letters of Eugippius and Pascasius have come down to us with the memoir as it left the hands of Eugippius; and these have now been edited by Knoell, who also prints from a Vatican MS. a hymn in praise of Severinus, first published by Ozanam.

The *Vita S. Severini* is one of several instances in which the two great series, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and the *Corpus Scrip. Eccles. Lat.*, cross each other. The first really critical edition of this work was published in the former series by Sauppe in 1877, and the corresponding volume in the Vienna series came out last year. It is natural to compare these two editions. Certainly a great advance was marked by Sauppe, who, if he had done nothing else, at least cleared away a number of useless MSS. and brought out the value of those on which his text was constructed. Knoell has succeeded in discovering several more primary MSS. in Italian libraries; he has collated these, and on the strength of data supplied by them he has largely altered Sauppe's text.

The MSS. now available are these :

- C* = Cod. Casinensis, saec. xi.—xii.
- G* = Cod. Vaticanus alter, saec. xi.—xii.
- L* = Cod. Lateranensis, saec. x.
- M* = Cod. Ambrosianus, saec. xii.
- N* = Cod. Vallicellianus, saec. xi.—xii.
- T* = Cod. Taurinensis, saec. x.
- V* = Cod. Vaticanus prior, saec. xi.

Knoell has also occasionally used three other MSS. from Monte Cassino, which are closely allied to *CGL*. He discussed at length the whole question of the relation of

the MSS. of the *Vita* to each other in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy for 1880. He pointed out that they fell into two main groups, *CGL* and *Codd. Casin.* on the one hand, and *TVMN* on the other, which might be described as practically South Italian and North Italian. Several of the MSS. of the first group come from Monte Cassino, while the chief representatives of the second group, *T* and *V*, can be traced to the library of Bobbio. Sauppe based his text mainly upon *L*; Knoell gives the preference to *T*, which he was the first to bring to light.

Now I am quite ready to admit that Knoell in his turn marks an advance upon Sauppe. He has done good service by the collation—in part his own, in part carried out for him by others—of *CGNT*. The criticisms that I was led to make on the collation of the MSS. of the *Excerpts* are not applicable here. The *Vita S. Severini* was in a more manageable compass, and the collation of the MSS. in this case all that could be desired. The existence of Sauppe's edition naturally led to the careful verification of all readings which had been noted differently, and I have little doubt that Knoell's apparatus may be trusted absolutely. But this is not all. He has set forth at length the principles which he has followed in framing his text, and, if he differs from Sauppe, gives his reasons for so doing. Up to a certain point I am quite prepared to go with him. I think he has proved that *L* is not fitted to supply the groundwork of a text. He has proved that there are many cases in which *L* has not preserved the original reading of its group. I incline to agree with him that when *G* (called *V*² in the *Sitzungsberichte*) goes over to *TV* its readings are preferable. I am ready to admit that there are readings in which the group *TV*, &c., is superior to *CGL*, but I do not think that this is so in all cases. I feel that it is hazardous to take a different view from one who has devoted to the subject years of study, but I confess that it seems to me that when the reading of the archetype of *CGL* can be clearly ascertained, and still more where this group is joined by a leading member of the other group, it deserves the preference.

I will give one or two examples in which I have little doubt that Knoell's text is wrong: and, first, some examples in which he seems to me to have either overlooked or not given due weight to the parallels which show which reading is most in keeping with the style of Eugippius:—

KNOELL.

- p. 23, 6, hunc coniuux, nomine Giso, semper a clementiae remediis renocabat.
- p. 26, 21, alioquin ab [om. CGL] imminenti periculo non cauebis.
This reading has apparently been influenced by *caue*, running in the mind of the scribe from two lines above.
- 42, 5, aliis ergo de tanto nuntio dubitantibus.
- 42, 17, Heruli irruentes oppidumque uexantes plurimos duxere captivos.

renocabat *MNTV*: retrahebat *CGL*; cf. p. 18, 3, ciues tantum ab opere dei nec prospera nec aduersa retraherent.

cauebis *MNTV*: carebis *CGL*; cf. p. 21, 4. Incredibili ossuum dolore contritus omni caruerat incolunitate membrorum; p. 68, 5, statim caruit omnium langore membrorum.

nuntio *NTV*: nuncio *M*: praesagio *CGL*; cf. p. 51, 14, memor illius praesagii quo eum quondam expresserat regnatum; p. 63, 2, Fredericus autem immemor contestationis et praesagii sancti uiri.

uexantes *MNTV*: uastantes *CGL*; cf. p. 50, 18, hunc populum non patiar saeua depredatione uastari, uel gladio trucidari aut in seruitutem redigi.

In most of these instances there can, I think, be little doubt that the more marked and characteristic expression is found in *CGL*, and it seems to me distinctly more probable that this has been obscured by

KNOELL'S TEXT.

- p. 18, 14, ipse uero ad secretum habitaculum saepius secedebat, ut hominum declinata frequentia oratione continua deo proprius inhaereret.
proprius (comparative of proprie) is a conjecture of Hartel's.
- 26, 13, ne is qui parentes reliquit et saeculum pompae saecularis inlecebras retrorsum aspiciendo cuperet.
- 31, 4, flammam concussis ex more lapidibus elicere nequiuissent.
- 31, 5, in tantum alterutra hac petrae conlisione tardantes.
- 51, 10, asserens uniuersos in(de) Romanos ad suas prouincias absque ullo libertatis migraturos incommode.
Knoell reads 'inde' by conjecture and in the rest follows *M* and *NTV* nearly.
- 64, 13, Sancti itaque corpusculum ad castellum nomine Felethem, † Mulse mensis regionis apportatum est.

paraphrase than that there has been an assimilation of the expression in one passage to that of another.

Of a somewhat different kind are the following:—

propius *CGM*: propitius *NTV*: propitio, L, Sauppe. I cannot see any good reason for not accepting propius: 'further from men, nearer to and more intent upon God' seems to me to be an easy and natural antithesis.

aspiciendo *MNTV*: respiciendo *CGL*.

Knoell (Praef. p. xi.) compares Sedulius, 'Nemo retrorsum. . . aspiciens soluendus erit.' But there is equally good authority for 'respiciendo.' Cf. Luke ix. 62, Lat-Vet. *codd. a b f*.

concussis *CG L*: concussit *L*: excussis *MNTV*.

Knoell retracts the reading 'concussis' (Praef. p. x.) in favour of 'excussis' on the strength of a line in Ovid—'ut excussis elisi nubibus ignes'—failing to see that an expression which is applicable to a cloud is not applicable to a stone.

hac petrae *MN*: ac petre *T*: ac petre *V*: ferri ac petre *CGL*.

I do not think that 'ferri ac petrae' is a conjectural emendation but the original reading, partly retained in *TV*; the dropping out of a word is an extremely simple and common form of corruption.

Asserens uniuersos in Romani soli prouinciam absque ullo, &c., *CG* and *L* practically.

The expression 'in Romani soli prouinciam' is slightly peculiar but I think quite tenable, and it expresses Engippius's meaning.

Mulse mensis regionis *NTV* ('sub mulse mensis regionis nomen regionis Italiae latere uidetur,' Knoell): multis emensis regionibus *CGL*.

I see no reason why this perfectly simple, easy and natural reading should be rejected.

In the text of the other examples it seems to me that Knoell has shown a misplaced ingenuity of suspicion which resorts to far-fetched explanations for that which is plain enough as it stands. I should certainly take no credit to myself for defending such obvious readings, but it is a perversion of scholarship to suppose that what is obvious is always

wrong. It is to me surprising that with all his experience of MSS. Knoell should not see how slight and in accordance with all analogy is the corruption involved. The reason is that he has contracted a prejudice against the readings of *CGL* which I fully believe to be mistaken, though he himself gives (p. x.) a list of by no means unimportant

ant readings which he has taken from that group as against his favourites *MNTV*. The number of these readings in which *CGL* have preserved the true text might, I am sure, be largely increased.

The question which affects the largest section of the text is that as to the genuineness of eighteen lines in the last chapter describing two miracles of healing wrought by the body of the saint on its entrance into Naples—neither of them of such a kind that they might not have been believed by a contemporary. The relation of these two miracles is contained in *CGL* and is wanting in *MNTV*. There are also corresponding variants in the *Capitula*: the verses in honour of Severinus imply the narrative: at the same time, as the MS. in which these are found is of the eleventh century, their evidence does not in strictness go back beyond that date, though it is probable that they were written much earlier. They clearly belong to a time when the fame of the saint was at its height.

Knoell argues elaborately against the genuineness of this section (*Sitzungsberichte*, p. 486 ff.); but here again I confess that his arguments seem to me anything but happy. He quotes a number of expressions from them which he thinks are imitations from the surrounding context: to me they seem to be not imitations, but coincidences of style which point to identity of authorship. Of the two hypotheses, in the case of naïve workmanship of this kind, I cannot but regard the latter as the more probable. And the other arguments which Knoell has advanced are of little weight.

I have found myself expressing so much dissent both from Knoell and from Hartel, whose conjectures are frequently mentioned and in several cases received, that I think it only right in conclusion to quote two examples in which they seem to me to have deserved the thanks of all scholars. There is a difficult passage, p. 28, 10, where the

MSS. have *tunc ergo qui eos* (sc. *cereos*) *posuerant diuino declarati examine, protinus exclamantes secreta pectoris satisfactionibus prodiderunt et suorum testimonio cereorum manifesta confessione conuicti propria sacrilegia testabantur*. For *satisfactionibus* Hartel proposes *satactionibus* in the sense of 'agitation.' In the *Corrigenda* Knoell would substitute for this *satisfactionibus* which would certainly involve a minimum of change, as the *f* might easily come in through the doubling of long *s* in a half-uncial hand. Is it just possible that *satisfactionibus* might = 'making amends for their faults'?¹ The other passage is one in which it seems to me that Knoell has both skilfully and successfully defended the reading of the MSS. In p. 41, 17, the MSS. read *quas* (sc. *reliquias*) . . . *susciptions basilicam sancti Iohannis . . . ultronea benedictione collata sacravit officio sacerdotum*. Knoell explains this quite satisfactorily by observing that *officio* is dative not ablative, and that *benedictio* = 'relics': 'he consecrated the basilica of St. John for priestly ministration (i.e. the celebration of the mass) by placing there the relics which offered themselves to his hand.' By a sudden inspiration Severinus had called for a boat, and crossing the Danube found on the bank a man who was bringing to him some relics of St. John the Baptist—the very thing that he wanted.

W. SANDAY.

I learn through the kindness of M. Delisle that the missing portions of the interesting Desnoyers MS. of the *Excerpts* of Eugippius (Cod. D, saec. viii., see *Classical Review*, no. 5, p. 141) are in the possession of the Earl of Ashburnham. M. Delisle ascertained this too late for the knowledge to be of use to the editor of the *Excerpts*.—W. S.

¹ I owe to a friend the following parallels from Cyprian: '*Deum movere satisfactionibus*' (*De Lapsis*, c. 36; ed. Hartel, p. 263, 27), '*Satisfactionibus inmorantes et Domini misericordiam deprecantes*' (*Ep.* lxx. 4; p. 725, 13).

AN APPEAL IN BEHALF OF THE ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXICOGRAPHIE.

THE following facts need only, I am sure, to be put before the English-speaking public, in order to set this undertaking on a sound financial basis.

Professor Wölfflin of Munich, the director, has not only received no remunera-

tion, but is two thousand marks out of pocket. The Munich Academy allows £25 a year towards the expenses, but that is handed over to Mr. Teubner, the publisher. Two hundred and fifty free copies are sent to the contributors, and only 280 copies are

sold. Surely England alone ought to take at least that number.

Three volumes are now complete, and cost 12s. each. Of volume iv two parts have appeared, and a double number will this year complete the volume.

It rests with the republic of scholars to determine whether, now that the staff of workers has been collected and drilled, specimen articles published and criticised, a zealous and capable editor and public-spirited publisher found, the projected Thesaurus of Latin shall be abandoned, or whether substantial aid shall be given at once, in order to ensure its success.

To every reader I venture to say :

Buy the book yourself, and see that any library which you can influence, does the same.

Let philological societies make a substantial grant in aid. When editor and publisher have been encouraged by a steady increase of subscriptions, let them issue a prospectus and specimen of the Thesaurus itself. There can be no doubt that England will call for as many copies as any other country.

I cannot think that scholars who have not yet seen the *Archiv* know what they lose by their neglect. Many hundreds of words are there for the first time registered, and the whole method of lexicography is criticised from many points of view, so that an eye, trained by travel through these 3½ volumes, will ever afterwards search the field of Latinity with a clearer vision and a more definite aim.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Les Cavaliers Athéniens. Par M. ALBERT MARTIN.
Paris. E. Thorin. 1886. 18 fr.

It may sound rather surprising at first to hear that it is possible to write a large octavo volume of 563 pages on the *ἵππεις* at Athens. But M. Martin, as he explains in the preface, takes a wide view of his subject: 'L'Histoire des Cavaliers athéniens c'est l'histoire religieuse, militaire, politique, économique et littéraire de l'ancienne Athènes . . . envisagée d'un point de vue particulier qui permet d'en saisir mieux les grandes lignes; . . . en étudiant cette histoire particulière, on voit l'histoire générale sous un jour un peu nouveau; il est donc possible d'apercevoir parfois des détails qui n'avaient pas encore été remarqués et d'apporter sur quelques points des explications nouvelles.' M. Martin has executed this difficult programme with great ability and freshness. Undoubtedly the book has defects; there are mis-translations that engender distrust in the accuracy of the author's scholarship, there are rash conjectures, there are elaborate theories built on nothing better than an ambiguous allusion. On the other hand, M. Martin has studied carefully the material provided by inscriptions, he has worked with wonderful diligence through a mass of literature and finally collected the fruits of his labour in a very readable book. For M. Martin has a respect for literary form which is not always felt by learned men: he writes clearly and with spirit, and sometimes, as when inspired by enthusiasm for 'l'aimable figure du fils d'Exékestide' or 'ces beaux athlètes nus,' with unusual eloquence.

M. Martin treats his subject in four books. He begins with the aristocracies which are already in the Homeric poems encroaching on the king and maintains, against Grote and Schoemann, that 'in the majority of Greek countries' the military strength of these aristocracies probably consisted of a force of chariots. The course of military development was interrupted in European Greece by the Dorian invasion which proved the superiority of heavy infantry. Only a few states were in a position to develop a cavalry numerous enough to contend against the new

tactics—hence the admitted insignificance of cavalry in many Greek states when history begins to dawn.

Passing to Attica in particular, he touches on the controversy as to the character of the four old Attic tribes without venturing an opinion except so far as to observe very justly that it seems improbable that the *ὄπλητες* were a governing equestrian aristocracy. An organised force of Athenian cavalry cannot be traced before the time of the Solonian constitution, some aspects of which M. Martin proceeds to discuss, devoting to the legislator, for whom he has an ardent admiration, nine chapters and nearly a hundred pages. Of course the mutilated fragment of Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* (Landwehr, *Papyr. Berol.* No. 163. *Frg.* I. b.) comes under consideration: M. Martin inclines to subscribe to the opinion of Blass that the archon Damasias mentioned in it is to be referred to 683 B.C.: he is the *last decennial* archon, and is succeeded by *nine annual* archons, four chosen from the *εὐπατρίδαι*, three from the *ἄποικοι*, two from the *δημιουργοί*, but some time before Solon the *εὐπατρίδαι* managed to reconquer sole power. I think this the most cumbrous of the rival hypotheses. In the review of the work of Solon what M. Martin is particularly eager to bring to light is that one great object of the division into classes was the organisation of military defence. 'Deux services importants, celui de la flotte et celui de la cavalerie, sont organisés par le moyen de deux prestations, la triérarchie et l'hippotrophie, qui sont réparties entre les citoyens, d'après une division du territoire, les naucraries, et une division des personnes, les classes censitaires' p. 295. To put it in another way, he contends, following Gilbert, that Solon was also the author of the division of each of the four tribes into three *τρίττες* and twelve *ναυκραρία*, and since Pollux (viii. 108) says that each *ναυκραρία* provided two horsemen and one ship, there is given a fleet of forty-eight ships, considerable for that time, and ninety-six horsemen, which is a respectable force. The trierarchy would fall on the *πεντακοσιομέδωνοι*, the class of *ἵππεις* would be liable for service in the cavalry. Here M. Martin has greatly exaggerated the value of his evidence. He confidently pronounces that Aristotle

attributed to Solon the institution of *τριττῦες* and *ναυκραταί*. What is the proof? First this extract from Photius: *ναυκρατῖα μὲν ὁποῖόν τι ἡ συμμορία καὶ ὁ δῆμος, ναύκρατος δὲ ὁποῖόν τι ὁ δήμαρχος, Σόλωνος οὕτως ὀνομάσαντος ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δὲ (ἐστὶν ὁ λέγει. Rose) 'ἐάν τις ναυκρατῖας ἀμφισβητῇ,' καὶ 'τοὺς ναυκράτους τοὺς κατὰ τὴν ναυκρατῖαν.'* I believe the words *Σόλωνος οὕτως ὀνομάσαντος* are a lexicographical reference, 'Solon having used the expression' i.e. in his Laws. M. Martin prefers to interpret 'Solon having given the name,' and concludes 'Solon then according to Aristotle created the *ναυκρατῖαι*.' So much for the first passage: the second is Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 37, 'Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ περὶ Κλεισθένους φησὶ: 'κατέστησε καὶ δημάρχους τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐπιμέλειαν τοῖς πρότερον ναυκράτοις: καὶ γὰρ τοὺς δῆμους ἀντὶ τῶν ναυκρατῶν ἐποίησεν,' οἱ πρότερον ναύκρατοι: εἶπε ὅπῃ Σόλωνος κατασταθέντες εἶπε καὶ πρότερον.' I see no evidence to prove that the Scholiast's note οἱ πρότερον ναύκρατοι κ.τ.λ. contains an allusion to the opinion of Aristotle in particular. But the citation to which M. Martin trusts most is drawn again from the article of Photius *ον ναυκρατῖα* ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους πολιτείας ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ διέταξε τὴν πόλιν ὁ Σόλων: 'φυλαὶ δὲ ἦσαν τέσσαρες καθάπερ πρότερον καὶ φυλοβασιλεῖς τέσσαρες: ἐκ δὲ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης ἦσαν νενενημένοι τριττῦες μὲν τρεῖς ναυκρατῖαι δὲ δώδεκα καθ' ἐκάστην.' M. Martin translates 'Il y eut quatre tribus comme autrefois et quatre rois de tribus; mais, de chaque tribu, on forma trois tritittes et douze naucraries,' and concludes (p. 90):—'La phrase d'Aristote ne peut signifier qu'une chose: Solon conserve les quatre tribus avec leurs rois; il crée les tritittes et les naucraries.' This I deny: without discussing the 'mais,' it is enough to point out that 'on forma' is not a precise translation of ἦσαν νενενημένοι. All that can be safely inferred from this detached fragment is that in Aristotle's opinion *ναυκρατῖαι* formed part of the constitution as reorganised by Solon, not that they were a new element introduced by him. M. Martin however goes farther, and sees in this passage an *intentional* correction of Herodotus, who mentions *ναύκρατοι* before Solon, in connexion with the attempt of Cylon (v. 71. οἱ πρωτάνες τῶν ναυκράτων ὅσπερ ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας), and not only sees this here but again in the fragment relating to Cleisthenes which has been quoted above (*κατέστησε δὲ καὶ δημάρχους κ.τ.λ.*): 'Aristote, à deux reprises, contredisait formellement Hérodote et attribuait à Solon l'institution des naucraries' p. 92. How strange after this to find the same man hesitating to pronounce that the remark made by Thucydides in narrating this attempt of Cylon (I. 126. τότε δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἐπρασσον) is aimed against Herodotus.

After the examination of the legislative work of Solon M. Martin attempts to determine with some precision when the Athenian cavalry was raised from 100, which he puts as its number after Cleisthenes' reforms, to 1,000, the number we meet at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. The following analysis will show the uncertainty of the calculations. At the time of the battle of Tanagra (457) the Athenian cavalry could not have numbered a thousand, for (1) in that case there would not have been in the army so large a contingent of Thessalian horse, (2) the defection of these Thesalians in the fight would not have produced such serious consequences, (3) only two horsemen fell on the Athenian side. (The evidence for this statement is Paus. I. 29. 6 ἐστὶ δὲ . . . στήλη μαχομένων ἔχουσα ἱππεῖς: Μελάνωρος σφισὶν ἐστὶ καὶ Μακράτος ὀνόματα—they fell at Tanagra. M. Martin comments p. 128.

n. 4. 'On avait l'habitude de graver sur la même stèle les noms de ceux qui avaient été tués dans le même combat ou la même expedition.' Now M. Martin himself naturally declines to put such an interpretation on the evidence of a monument which gives only one horseman as killed at Coronea (394): that is the monument of a single tribe only. The monument mentioned by Pausanias may also have belonged to a single tribe or may have been erected in honour of distinguished valour. Again at the time of the battle of Coronea (447) the Athenian cavalry could not have numbered a thousand, for apparently there was no cavalry in Tolmides' army. (This is a very odd argument; there was not a large force of cavalry to take because Tolmides apparently took none. But Plutarch (*Vit. Per.* c. 18) represents Pericles as criticising just this, the irregularity and rashness of Tolmides' expedition). So much for the *terminus post quem*; the *terminus ante quem* is given by the frieze of the Parthenon which was opened in 438/7. 'Jamais on n'aurait pensé à accorder un tel rôle à la cavalerie si ce corps n'avait eu encore qu'un effectif de cent hommes' p. 131. Further in 438 this cavalry of a thousand must already have figured in a Panathenaic procession, i.e. at the previous celebration, in 442. Now the years 447–445 were years of disaster for Athens. Probably then Pericles, taught by experience the need of a stronger force, reorganised the cavalry between 445 and 442. Finally 'dans la manière dont Phidias a interprété cette *πομπή* sur la frise de la cella, nous verrions une preuve, un souvenir de l'impression profonde que produisit sur le peuple ce magnifique spectacle quand, pour la première fois, ce corps d'élite, composé de ce qu'Athènes avait de plus brillante jeunesse, parti, en rangs nombreux, du Céramique pour se rendre à l'Acropole,' p. 134.

The second book deals with the part played by this corps of *ἱππεῖς* in the religious festivals of Athens, particularly the Thesea and Panathenaea. Here there is much that is excellent, a brilliant and sympathetic description of the Hellenic festival with the procession, the sacrifice, and the *ἀγῶνες*, a clear summary of the development of 'l'agonistique' in Greece and Athens, a minute exposition of the differences between the various contests of the *ἀγῶν ἱππικὸς*. M. Martin carefully examines a set of inscriptions discovered since the time of Krause, his chief predecessor in this department, for the Thesea C.I.A. II. 444–448, for the Panathenaea C.I.A. II. 2. 965–969. Unluckily these inscriptions are more or less mutilated and all (with the exception of C.I.A. II. 2. 965—first part of fourth century) are as late as the first half of the second century, so that M. Martin's speculations as to the period at which the cavalry first officially took part in various contests are highly uncertain. But this the author candidly confesses.

It is in the third book that I find most to criticise. M. Martin discusses in this section the organisation of the corps—the obligation to serve, the *δοκιμασία*, the nature of the *κατάστασις*, the fluctuating numbers of the force, the pay, officers, equipment etc. It is a delicate task to interpret justly the sense of passing observations and disconnected allusions, and M. Martin's desire for a neat and intelligible system proves too strong for his prudence. Moreover some slips of scholarship lead to serious misconceptions. Take for instance Ps.-Demosth. c. *Phoenipp.* 24: ἱπποτρόφος ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶ καὶ φιλότιμος ἅτε νέος καὶ πλούσιος καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν. τί τούτου μέγα σημείον; ἀποδόμενος τὴν πολεμιστήριον ἵππον καταβέβηκεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἵππων καὶ ἀντ' ἐκείνου ἔχημα αὐτῷ τηλικούτος ἐν ἐώνηται κ.τ.λ. M. Martin has, 'En est-il une meilleure preuve? Il a vendu son cheval de guerre,

il est sorti du corps des cavaliers etc.' Surely the words can only mean 'He has come down from horseback, (has given up riding) and has effeminately taken to a carriage.' And on page 304 all M. Martin's inferences are overthrown by the simple observation that in Lysias V. 43 he has neglected ἀλλὰ μὴν and taken οὐδὲ as 'not even' when it is 'neither.' The way in which the author has occasionally done violence to common sense may be best illustrated by considering the evidence for the following statement at the end of the chapter on the method of recruiting the cavalry. 'Le citoyen riche qui n'est pas valide est tenu, puisqu'il ne peut pas contribuer de sa personne, de contribuer de ses biens, Ἀγρουργεῖ χρήμασι; il arme, il monte à ses frais des citoyens pauvres qui combattront à sa place: enfin on peut encore avoir recours à lui pour les diverses dépenses qu'exige le service de la cavalerie.' The proof may be reduced to a single passage in Xenophon, *Hipparch.* ix. 5. Xenophon has suggested that it might be a good thing to establish a force of 200 mercenary horsemen. He finishes thus: εἰς δὲ τιμὴν τῶν ἵππων νομίζω ἂν αὐτοῖς χρήματα ὑπάρχειν καὶ παρὰ τῶν σφόδρα ἀνεχομένων μὴ ἱππεύειν, ὅτι καὶ οἱς καθίστησι τὸ ἱππικὸν ἐθέλουσι τελεῖν ἀργύριον ὥς μὴ ἱππεύειν, παρὰ πλουσίων γε, ἀδυνάτων δὲ τοῖς σώμασι, οἰομαι δὲ καὶ παρ' ὀφθαλμῶν τῶν δυνατοῦς οἴκους ἐχόντων. The clause from ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἱππεύειν has provoked much conjecture: M. Martin expels καθίστησι τὸ ἱππικὸν 'as a gloss' and supposes that the abbreviations of ὅτι and οἱομαι were confused. The whole passage as reconstructed runs thus: εἰς δὲ τιμὴν τῶν ἵππων νομίζω ἂν αὐτοῖς χρήματα ὑπάρχειν καὶ παρὰ τῶν σφόδρα ἀνεχομένων μὴ ἱππεύειν, εἰσι (sic) καὶ οἱ (sic) ἐθέλουσι τελεῖν ἀργύριον ὥς μὴ ἱππεύειν, καὶ παρὰ πλουσίων μὲν γε, ἀδυνάτων δὲ τοῖς σώμασι, οἰομαι δὲ καὶ παρ' ὀφθαλμῶν τῶν δυνατοῦς οἴκους ἐχόντων. Now let all these changes be granted and still it is not legitimate to infer from Xenophon's proposal that it was customary (p. 319) at the time, much less obligatory for the rich citizen to provide a substitute if physically unable to serve on horseback. But M. Martin also detects in the passage an allusion to the *κατάστασις* mentioned in Lysias XVI. 6 and in Harpocration. I think the passage may be turned against his explanation. According to M. Martin, the *κατάστασις* is analogous to the 'aes equestre' at Rome, except that at Athens the state did not present to the newly-enrolled ἱππεὺς money to buy a mount for himself (and servant p. 344), but lent it: the sum was refunded when he passed out of the corps. There is no positive testimony in support of this, and—to pass over the contradictions in which M. Martin's exposition of the theory is involved—there is much that makes against it, as for example the remarkable absence in literature of any distinction such as that between 'equites equo publico' and 'equites equo privato'; and in the arguments against the hypothesis, I should include the passage from the *Hipparchicus*, understanding it to imply that in establishing a force of mercenary cavalry the state would have to reckon with an unusual expenditure; it would be obliged to provide horses.

The fourth and last book is entitled 'Les Cavaliers dans la Société Athénienne.' The author examines the value of the force as a military arm, and brings out very clearly the increasing importance of cavalry in warfare as the Macedonian period approaches. Drawn from the wealthier classes, these 'Knights' have in politics pronounced aristocratic sympathies, and their contests with Cleon and support of the Four Hundred and Thirty are sketched in lively prose. Not less interesting is the place they take in art and literature: 'ils sont une sorte de jeunesse dorée;

dans la ville d'Alcibiade ils appartiennent à la muse comique comme, dans la cour de Louis XIV, le petit marquis.' An attempt to estimate the policy of the 'aristocratical party' concludes a book that is very interesting if not always accurate.

W. WYSE.

Paléographie des Classiques Latins, collection de Facsimilés, publiée par ÉMILE CHATELAIN. Paris: Hachette. 1884—1887 (5 livraisons; 15 francs each.)

M. CHATELAIN's scheme for publishing a series of facsimiles of MSS. of Latin Classics was announced in 1884, and the first livraison appeared in that year. With the hopefulness which cheers on a new enterprise, the editor fixed the year 1887 as the date for the completion of his work; but, having regard to the difficulties and hindrances which must inevitably arise in such an ingathering of scattered material, we are in no way surprised to find M. Chatelain just midway, if indeed so far, on his journey. The fifth livraison has just appeared; and we feel pretty confident that ten livraisons, the number originally announced for the completion of the series, will not suffice for a proper exhaustion of the subject. Seventy-five plates, containing facsimiles of upwards of one hundred MSS., have been issued. The subjects for the greater number, in fact more than a third of the whole, have been found in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. The Vatican supplies about a score; and Florence, Leyden, St. Gall, Milan, Vienna, and several other continental towns have been drawn upon for the rest. No MSS. in English libraries have yet been touched. Thus it is to be feared that M. Chatelain has still a good many years' work before him ere he can cease from his labours. Meanwhile, *Vita brevis!* Posterity will in any case be happy. For ourselves, we will hope for long days; and in order to stimulate M. Chatelain's praiseworthy efforts, we would urge all classical students to subscribe, for the series, the very moderate sum which the publishers have fixed.

The authors to whom M. Chatelain has hitherto devoted his attention are Plautus, Terence, Varro, Catullus, Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Lucretius, and Virgil. Cicero occupies two entire livraisons; Virgil one. A large proportion of the plates, as was naturally to be expected, represent MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries, of which period so many fortunately survive. For specimens of classical MSS. of earlier date recourse must be had, with few exceptions, to the palimpsest fragments and other imperfect MSS. of more remote times. In some instances the condition of these fragments has driven the editor to repeat in his series the same specimens that have already appeared in other works. This was unavoidable. Generally however M. Chatelain gives us fresh pages, which we gratefully welcome. We would however say a word with regard to the dates which are ascribed to these early MSS. In a work like the present, in which the letter-press is restricted to narrow dimensions, one must not expect explanations of the editor's views; but it is a little startling to find M. Chatelain differing, in certain cases, very widely from opinions which have been given by other students in the same department. Professors Zangemeister and Wattenbach made a special study of most of these early classical fragments and have given their reasons for the dates which they have assigned to them in their *Exempla*. Their judgment is not lightly to be set aside. Nor are we altogether satisfied with M. Chatelain's dating of his later specimens. Many of the MSS. which he attributes to the ninth century appear rather to belong to the

tenth; some, attributed to the tenth, to belong to the eleventh; and so on, with others. In these latter instances, however, some latitude is allowable for difference of opinion; and a cautious palaeographer will be slow to lay down an *ipse dixit* on view of a facsimile alone, without sight of the MS. also. But no one will find fault with the plates. They are excellently produced by the Dujardin process, and also do credit to M. Chatelain's skill as an amateur photographer; for we understand that he makes most of the negatives himself.

Plautus, the author who opens the series, is represented by five MSS., at the head of which stand the palimpsest fragments of the Ambrosian Library, written in rustic capitals of the fourth century. Terence follows with a plate from the codex Bembinus, and, amongst others, with facsimiles from the three MSS. at Paris, Milan, and Rome, here ascribed to the ninth century, all of which are illustrated with drawings preserving the traditional classical character of the prototype. Another MS. in St. Peter's at Rome has blank spaces left for the insertion of the pictures. Of Varro there is but one early MS. extant, a Lombardic copy of the eleventh century. An interesting MS. of the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century, containing an extract from this author and belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale, is here also represented. Catullus likewise is one of those authors whose full texts are only to be found in late MSS. of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The codex Thuanus of the ninth century contains only *carmen lxii*. For a complete copy of Catullus we have to descend to an Italian MS. which bears the date of 1375.

The facsimiles of the works of Cicero, as we have already said, occupy two entire livraisons, and are drawn from as many as fifty-four MSS. in many different libraries and of many periods. We note among the MSS. which appear to have escaped the attention of recent editors a copy of *The Rhetorica "ad Herennium"* of the ninth century at Berne (pl. xvi. 2), and another Lombardic MS. of the same work in the Laurenziana (pl. xvii. 1); the Catiline orations in a MS. at Milan, here assigned to the tenth century (pl. xxviii. 3); and the "*de Senectute*," of the ninth century, at Leyden (pl. xli. 1). Plate xxvi. contains a facsimile of the oration "*in Pisonem*" written in uncial characters of the eighth century in the MS. (Orelli's V.) in St. Peter's at Rome; and in pl. xlv. we have a page of the Tusculans from the interesting Paris MS. 6332 of the ninth century, written in stichometrical arrangement. The palimpsests are to be seen in pl. xxix., containing one of the Ambrosian fragments of orations, of which very little can now be deciphered, and one of the Turin fragments "*pro Tullio*," the delicate capitals of which may well be of the fourth century to which they are assigned; in pl. xxx., in which is the single leaf of the Verrine orations, at Turin, which M. Chatelain would place as early as the third century; in pl. xxxii., giving the Vatican Verres written in capitals of the third or fourth century, and an almost illegible uncial fragment of the "*pro Fonteio*" also in the Vatican and ascribed to the fifth century; and in pl. xxxix., which contains a leaf of the great Vatican MS. of the "*de Republica*" in uncials of the fourth century.

Caesar is represented by six facsimiles; Sallust by eight; Lucretius by six. In pl. li. M. Chatelain has given a copy of one side of the early fragment of Sallust in the Vatican, the date of which is set in the third century. The other side is given in Zangemeister and Wattenbach's *Exempla*.

The fifth livraison which has just appeared is

NO. VIII. VOL. I.

devoted to facsimiles of the MSS. of Virgil; and of the eighteen specimens which are given eight represent those ancient codices or fragments of the works of the poet so famous among the ancient relics of Latin literature. It is in his estimate of the age of certain of these specimens that M. Chatelain differs so widely from other modern opinions. In the first place he sets before us one of the four leaves of the Vatican MS. (No. 3256), written in large square capitals, as of the second or third century; in the *Exempla*, one of the three leaves of the same MS., which Pertz was so fortunate as to secure for the Berlin Library, is given with the more modest date of the end of the fourth century. The date of the fourth century assigned to the two following specimens, viz. the St. Gall fragments and the "*Schedae Vaticanae*," is in general agreement with the received opinion; but why M. Chatelain should place the two great rustic MSS. of the Vatican so low in the scale, the "*Palatinus*" in the fifth century, and the "*Romanus*" in the sixth century, we are at a loss to divine. The editors of the *Exempla* held another opinion, and considered them as surpassing all other MSS. in "*sincerae antiquitatis specie*." The sixth specimen is taken from the "*Mediceus*," the only one of these early codices which contains internal evidence for an approximate date. In the last plate are given facsimiles of the almost illegible palimpsest of Verona and the Paris MS. of Asper's commentary on Virgil. Among the minuscule specimens we note a facsimile of the Berne MS. of the *Aeneid* with its numerous scholia, some of which are written in Tironian shorthand.

In conclusion we would draw attention to the bibliographical information and to the careful references to other facsimiles of individual MSS. which M. Chatelain has printed in the letter-press.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

Notes on Thucydides, Book I. By R. GEARE, B.A.,
Assistant Master King's College School. 2s. 6d.

THESE notes are intended chiefly for the upper middle forms in public schools, and are adapted to the Oxford text, both in readings and in the division of chapters. Mr. Geare has done his work well; his notes are judiciously compiled, and are as a rule clear and scholarlike. Nor are they such as to encourage laziness and supersede the use of grammar and dictionary; they do not give too much translation or translate too literally. Indeed the careless school-boy may find himself entrapped by such free renderings as *ὅτι τοῦ γενομένου σεισμοῦ*, 'by the occurrence of an earthquake' (c. 101); *ὄρατε ὅπως μὴ αἰσχίον καὶ ἀπορότερον τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ πράξωμεν*, 'that we do not bring greater shame and difficulties upon the Peloponnese' (c. 82). On this latter passage Mr. Geare is careful to note that the subjunctive after *ὅπως μὴ* violates an almost universal rule. Taking any chapters of recognised difficulty, e.g. 76 and 77, as a test, we find no superfluous annotation, and fairly sufficient help throughout. We might, however, expect a note on *ἐλασσοσύμενοι* (c. 77, init.), and on *γνώμη* (opposed to *δυνάμει*), which is merely translated 'in a question of right.' Mr. Shilleto gives 'judicial sentence.' Again, *οὐ προσέειπεν τὰς ἀρχάς* (c. 90) surely requires a note on the use of the abstract *ἀρχάς*, and in the same chapter the force of *ὅτι* in *ὅτι ἐπειδὴν* is not adequately explained by the bare rendering, 'giving them to understand.' In his historical and geographical notes, Mr. Geare gives very useful help, and his book is also provided with a good index.—C. E. G.

R

PLATO AND MARCUS AURELIUS FOR
ENGLISH READERS.

Socrates, a translation of the Apology, Crito, and parts of the Phaedo. Sixth edition. FISHER UNWIN. 1887. 3s. 6d.

Talks with Socrates about life, from the Gorgias and Republic. FISHER UNWIN. 1887. 3s. 6d.

EVERY one must welcome these attempts to bring within the reach of the many some of the best and noblest teaching of the Ancient World. The price is low, and binding, paper and print are alike satisfactory, except that the type of the *Socrates* is rather worn. The translation, if not quite up to the standard of Prof. Jowett, is in general accurate and easy. Both volumes of Plato begin with a useful introduction by the anonymous American translator, and the first volume is further recommended by a preface written by one whose name is held in honour by all English scholars, Prof. Goodwin of Harvard University.

Marcus Aurelius. Translated by JEREMY COLLIER, revised by ALICE ZIMMERN. Camelot Series. W. SCOTT. 1887. 1s.

COMPARATIVELY little has been done for the elucidation of the language of Marcus Aurelius; and it is often difficult, first, to make sure that one has caught the right sense, and then to express it in words which shall be intelligible, and yet not entirely lose the abrupt short-hand manner of the original. Miss Zimmern takes the old Non-juror's translation as the basis of her own, and she succeeds in giving a rendering which, if less accurate, is at any rate more readable than Long's, as will be evident from the following versions of a passage taken at random from III. 2:—

'We ought to observe also that even the things which follow after the things which are produced according to nature contain something pleasing and attractive. For instance, when bread is baked, some parts are split at the surface, and these parts which thus open and have a certain fashion contrary to the purpose of the baker's art, are beautiful in a manner and in a peculiar way excite a desire for eating.'—LONG.

'It is worth while to observe that the least thing which happens naturally to things natural has something in itself that is pleasing and delightful. Thus for example there are cracks and little breaks on the surface of a loaf, which, though never intended by the baker, have a sort of agreeableness in them which invites the appetite.'—ZIMMERN.

Collier's style however, *i.e.* the jaunty and obtrusively familiar style affected by the fine gentleman of the close of the seventeenth century, is, if not, what Long calls it, 'a most coarse and vulgar copy of the original,' yet hardly the right medium for the solitary musings of the imperial philosopher; and Miss Zimmern has on the whole done wisely in pruning its excrescences and so bringing it nearer to the original Greek. Here and there we think she has changed for the worse. For instance, it is surely only a perverse literalness to write 'from my governor I learned not to join either the green or the blue faction on the race-ground, nor to support the Parmularius or Scutarius at the gladiators' shows,' instead of Collier's 'I learned not to overvalue the diversions of the race-ground and amphitheatre, nor to dote upon the liveries and distinctions of jockeys and gladiators.' To the ordinary English reader the latter version really represents the thought of the writer more exactly than the former, because there is nothing here of pedantry or antiquarianism in the language of Aurelius. And why omit the very

characteristic *οὔτε παραφρόδος, οὔτε πόρνη* ('neither rant nor wheedle') of V. 28?¹

But the chief shortcomings of the new translation arise from a too close following of the old. Thus in I 15 *εὐθυμία* is rightly translated 'cheerfulness' in L., but 'to be full of spirits' in C. and Z.; in I 16 *ἀτραγῶδως* ('without display' L.) is 'without hurry or being embarrassed' C. and Z.; II 7 *παῦσαι βεμβόμενος* ('cease to be whirled about' L.) is 'cease rambling' C. and Z.

We add some examples where C. and Z. both go wrong, but in different ways:—

III 4 *ἡ γὰρ ἐκάστω νεμομένη μοῖρα συνεμφέρεται τε καὶ συνεμφέρει* ('the lot assigned to each is a constituent element of the whole, partly determining it, partly determined by it') is translated 'every man's fate is suitable, since it is suited to him' Z.; III 6 *ἀπόφηναι* ('say so' L.) 'reject it' Z.; VII 28 *εἰς σαυτὸν συνειλοῦ* ('retire into thyself' L.) 'rely upon yourself' Z.

While then on the whole we should rank this first of the complete English translations of Aurelius (Prof. Crossley's excellent version is at present limited to a single book), it will be seen from the specimens we have given, that there is plenty of room for improvement in a new edition.

Platonische Studien. By H. BONITZ. 3rd ed. Berlin, Vahlen, 1886. 7 Mk.

Ueber die Unterscheidung einer doppelten Gestalt der Ideenlehre in der platonischen Schriften. By E. ZELLER. (Sitzungsberichte der Kön. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin xii. pp. 197—220, Mar. 3, 1887.)

THE third edition of Bonitz's admirable work contains few alterations. References to recent literature have been added in the foot-notes. There is an additional paper, first read in 1878, in which the difficult passage *Phaedo* 62 A is treated grammatically: *τοῦτο* is taken (as *τοῦτο ποιεῖν* in 61 E) as *αὐτὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀποκτινύναι*; Wytenbach's punctuation is adopted, viz. a comma after *οἷς βέλτιον*, so that the words *ὥσπερ καὶ τάλαια ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον* all go together; and the following sense is obtained: 'it may seem strange that suicide should be something invariable, and should not be permitted in many cases, where, namely, death is a benefit.' In the Theætetus one slight modification is admitted: in deference to the criticism of Kreienbühl the section 170 A—179 C (exclusive of the digression) is no longer presented as the decisive and valid refutation, in Plato's sense, of the Protagorean maxim.

Bonitz displays the sagacity, moderation and practical good sense which English scholars especially prize. The merit of his book is the restriction of its aim—simply to understand each separate dialogue as a whole and to reproduce the author's intention in composing it. Hence the prominence given to analysis and arrangement, the questions of primary importance being the discovery of natural divisions in the dialogue, and the relations of the various subordinate parts to the whole and to each other. When all this has been settled there is still room for an occasional discussion, *e.g.* upon the scope and results of the *Sophist*, or upon the genuineness of the *Euthydemus* (against Schaarschmidt). Perhaps in such discussions it is hard to avoid going beyond the limits prescribed. The reasons given (p. 264 *sqq.*) for pronouncing certain propositions defended by Socrates in the *Protagoras* to be unplatonic, strike

¹ For construction we must supply something like *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν*.

one as in curious contrast to the general tone of the exposition.

From these fruitful and suggestive studies we pass to the searching criticism which another honoured veteran has applied to Dr. Jackson's articles on the Later Theory of Ideas published during the past five years in the *Journal of Philology*. Zeller has obviously studied them carefully, though he may not in every case have caught the writer's precise intention: thus it will be found that the 'thorough-going idealism' which Jackson and Archer-Hind attribute to Plato is not fairly described as phenomenalism. Zeller meets the English scholar with uncompromising opposition. He admits that a change was made in the system towards the end of Plato's life, but he denies that there are appreciable traces of it in the later dialogues: at least, such traces as Jackson perceives. Accordingly he undertakes to prove (1) that in the five later dialogues (as Jackson assumes them to be)—*Philebus*, *Parmenides*, *Timaeus*, *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*—ideas of other than natural objects are recognised, and that these are ideas κατ' αὐτὰ, for he urges that neither Plato nor Aristotle knew of any other ideas, or ideas which are mere categories: (2) that the relation of particulars to ideas expressed by the term *imitation* (μίμησις) is found in the earlier dialogues and is therefore not a peculiarity of these five; and (3) that Plato had not, when he wrote the latter, abandoned the doctrine of *participation* (μέθεξις). To this main contention is joined a criticism of the view which attributes to Plato an analysis of the sensible thing into sensations in our mind; and of the interpretations which Dr. Jackson puts upon *Theaet.* 156 A *sqq.* and *Sophist* 246 A, 248 A *sqq.* Zeller repeats his well-known opinion that the doctrine of the *Sophist* is the farthest of all from that attributed by Aristotle to Plato, and argues that the close connexion of the *Sophist* with the *Theaetetus* forbids our assuming for it a date much later than 390 B. C. Taking up this conservative attitude, it is natural that he should believe the *Philebus* to be cited in the *Republic*, and should distrust the inferences drawn by Dittenberger (and later by Schanz) from the Platonic use of certain particles and phrases, as *μήν*, *τῷ ὅντι* and *ὅντως*, &c. His determination of the date of the *Theaetetus* is certainly ingenious. From 175 A Rohde had argued that Agesilaus was the king who traced back his line by twenty-five ancestors to Heracles. Zeller shows that Agesilaus will not suit, while Agesipolis, who reigned from 394 to 380, will. Hence he infers the battle of Corinth in which Theaetetus is wounded must be the earlier one, of 392, not the later one of 368 B. C. And he even argues from the metaphorical term *πελαστικός ἀνὴρ* in *Theaet.* 165 D that the use of these mercenaries was something recent and striking at the date of the dialogue.

From Dr. Jackson's side it cannot be said that these chronological difficulties are fatal. An earlier date for the *Theaetetus* is made more probable than it was lately thought to be: but it is very obvious that we have received nothing like a cogent proof that it must come as early as 390, or in fact before the *Phaedo* and *Republic*. But it is the development of Platonic doctrine which is the real turning-point of the controversy. It will be interesting to see how Dr. Jackson replies to Zeller's objections.—R. D. H.

Gaii Iulii Caesaris de bello Gallico Commentarii, after the German of Kraner-Dittenberger. By Rev. JOHN BOND, M.A., and A. S. WALPOLE, M.A. London. Macmillan. 6s.

THE editors have reproduced in substance Dittenberger's revision of Kraner's excellent school edition, and have added some fresh material from various

sources. The omission of Hirtius' supplementary eighth book, which must on no account be despised merely because it was not written by Caesar, is to be regretted, as the want of it leaves the history of the Gallic campaigns incomplete. The notes, so far as I have examined them, are clear and concise. A few points require correction. The word 'physical' in the explanation of *firmitas*, i. 3, § 8, is rather misleading (the reference there given should be v. 54, § 2); nor is it quite wise to say, on i. 5, § 4, that *is* ought to be *se*, or, on v. 11, § 4, that *sunt* should be *sint*; the natural inference in an observant schoolboy's mind being either that Caesar did not write good Latin, or that the MSS. are at fault, neither of which suppositions would be correct. Misleading too is the note on i. 6, § 2, *transitur = transeundus est*. On v. 13, § 3, Pytheas of Marseilles is apparently distinguished from 'Greek Authors.' On vi. 20, Kraner's wrong reference (Cic. *Fam.* ix. 80) is reproduced. On vii. 1, Kraner's note, 'der geängstigte Senat ermächtigte, da es nicht zu einer Consulwahl kam, den Pompeius,' &c. (I quote from Kraner's tenth edition), is thus translated: 'As the Senate in its panic could not choose consuls, it empowered Pompey,' &c. A less important mistranslation occurs in vii. 3: 'Partly to lend out their money on interest, in places where they were not restricted by usury laws as in Rome,' for 'theils um ihr Geld auf Zinsen auszuleihen (wobei sie nicht durch Wuchergesetze, wie zu Rom, beschränkt waren).' These mistranslations make one mistrustful of the editors' knowledge of German. In the account of the Bridge the editors are content to follow Kraner without any discussion of the difficulties of Caesar's description, or any intimation that such difficulties exist. The literature on this subject is becoming large, and I may refer the editors, if they are not already acquainted with it, to Heller's review of A. Schleusinger's 'Studie zu Caesar's Rheinbrücke' in the *Philologischer Anzeiger*, 1884, xiv. pp. 531-548, as well as to the interesting communication from Mr. E. V. Arnold in the *Classical Review* for June. I do not understand on what principle two special plans of sites (taken from Rutherford's edition of Book II.) are given, and no others. When Kampen's maps are so cheap and accessible, why give any plans at all? or if any, why these, which are hardly the most important? In point of typographical correctness, this edition requires careful revision; the following misprints may be mentioned: in the general map, *Novidunum* on the Aisne, *Mediolanum* in Gallia Cisalpina; *Introd.* p. xvii. note, *dant* (without reference); *Notes*, p. 233, *silvis*; p. 288, *lavarent*; p. 289, *vocare*; p. 310, *cadum* (with wrong punctuation); p. 329, *augere*; p. 337, *Belon*; Geogr. Index, p. 398, *extramas*. On p. 295, 'at the end of the Notes,' should be 'at the end of the Introduction.' In the Index it is tantalising to see 'derivation of *soldurii*,' and on turning to the reference to find 'derivation unknown.' The name of M. Desjardins is spelt wrongly throughout.

It will be seen that the work needs to be thoroughly revised from beginning to end. When this is done, and I hope the editors will do it, for it is well worth doing, the new edition will be a good serviceable book, which may be confidently recommended for school use.—A. G. P.

Caesar, B. G. IV. Edited by CLEMENT BRYANS, M.A. 1s. 6d.

THIS is one of Macmillan's useful Elementary Classics edited in compact form with vocabularies for beginners.

Mr. Bryans, as a practical schoolmaster, knows by instinct the scale on which his notes should be; and this is a great point. The notes seem on the whole to be about the right length, and to touch the right points: occasional divergences from what is strictly necessary are pardonable and even welcome, as e.g. the collection of uses of *quin*, p. 41, or the more superfluous note on the gerund, p. 59.

The following may be perhaps improved in another edition. P. 32. *in vicem*, not 'for a turn,' but like *in numerum*, *in verum*. P. 34, 2. *co ut* cannot mean 'for this reason that': the *quo* is comparable to *non quo*. P. 40, 7. *qua spe* is better explained as 'by hope of which' like *is terror*, 'fear of that.' To say *spe* = 'hopes' is misleading. P. 41, 11. 'ought to be imperf.' is unfortunate: the usage is normal. P. 41, 3. *posse* imperf. inf. is surely wrong: it is oblique of *potest*. the imperf. *remaneant* is due to the past *respondit*. P. 44, 13. *obsessit* is suboblique simply, not 'attracted.' P. 54, 18. *in satis profectum* (like *satis factum*), the *satis* is subject.

A. S.

Ovid's Tristia. Book I. Edited by S. G. OWEN.
3s. 6d.

THIS is a thoroughly scholarly edition, to which the editor has devoted enormous pains, and no small amount of research. The value of the latter, which is chiefly conspicuous in the treatment the poet's autobiography, and in the editing of the text, it hardly falls within the province of a reviewer of schoolbooks to estimate. We may say however that the introduction is in its handling of facts complete, clear, and able: and judgment is shown in the selection of readings. The author has presented a tolerably complete picture of Ovid's life and the circle of his friends; and has made out an exceedingly good case for the conjecture that the poet's exile was due to his complicity with the intrigue between Julia and Silanus. The least satisfactory part of the introduction is the section on the literary value of the *Tristia*. The editor too much takes the tone of an advocate for his author. For example it is going too far to hold up to our admiration Ovid's expression of affection for his loving wife. Whatever the poet was, he was not a family man: and the consolation to his wife is as hollow as can be. When he tells her to imitate the empress, we see the object of the letter: and we cannot agree with the taste or the truth of the remark that the poor woman 'deserved a happier but not a better husband.' It is still worse when the editor justifies the querulous unmanliness of the *Tristia* by the remark:—

'There is as much of sorrow as of happiness in the world: and it is the function of the poet to sing of the sadder aspects of human life as well as the happier.'

and refers us in a note to *sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt*. No human being really feels that Ovid got more than he deserved: and it gives one a positive shock to find, brought into comparison together, the unspeakable line of the great poet, which has touched the very springs of feeling for centuries, and the *me miserum's* and *a! quotiens* of the shallow selfish libertine who had a gift for verses.

Apart from these faults of taste—which we have dwelt on disproportionately—the introduction is good and valuable. Our only misgiving is, that the evidence of erudition is so considerable as to be terrifying to the schoolboy: and we should have preferred to have first the complete scholar's edition of the book, where such erudition would have been in place, and then an abridged one for schools, with much fewer references. The same remark applies to

the *apparatus criticus* of the text: for the easy elegiacs of Ovid are chiefly read in those parts of a school where critical editions are superfluous.

The notes seem very thorough, and though long on the whole, are not prolix or irrelevant. A great deal might be learnt from them by any reader: though no doubt the fourth or fifth form boy (who will probably use the book) will find much that might without loss be concealed from him. It must also be said, and this is the real merit of the notes, that he will really find what he wants.

We have marked one or two details where improvement might be made, chiefly in grammatical points, where the editor is generally very careful.

i. 79. A note is quoted of Professor Nettleship's about the imperfect subjunctive of past time, in a way which suggests that it is an unusual use. One seems a survival of the once common but erroneous theory that the imperfect subj. refers normally only to present time. There is again a want of clearness in the note on i. 125, *si ferres . . . futurum eras*, which simply means 'had you been carrying . . . you would have been,' *futurus eras* being the same periphrasis for past conditional as *futurum fuisse* in or. obl. See also p. 70 note on 14.

i. 88. The word *restrictis* is a pity. It is only true in the sense in which all consecutives are restrictive. It is better to confine the use of the word *restrictive* consecutives to the well-marked class of which examples are *ita omisi ut leviter tangerem, ita abii ut portam tamen non clauderem*.

iii. 47. Why should *praecipitata* be middle? The middle (i.e. true reflexive) use is clearly employed by Augustans; but need not be violently introduced where the common passive meaning is natural and sufficient.

But these are very small points in seventy pages of notes which are unusually accurate and complete.

A. S.

Kleine philologische Schriften von THEODOR BERGK.
Herausgegeben von R. Peppmüller. II. Band.
Zur griechischen Literatur. Halle a. S., Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 1886. Pp. xcv. 813.
12 mk.

THIS volume, which is a library in itself rather than a book, would require to review it the learning of another Bergk and the space of a whole magazine. All that it is possible to do is to note the contents briefly. More it is unnecessary to do, for the volume contains nothing which has not been published before. Less must not be done, because many of Bergk's minor writings on Greek literature are not included in this volume; and there is a danger lest students not knowing its contents should buy it for the sake of some dissertation which it does not contain. What has been Herr Peppmüller's principle of selection it is difficult to discover, for several of the treatises which he has republished might well have been excluded to make room for others which he has not printed and which, from his preface, there seems to be no great likelihood of his printing in collected form hereafter. Some papers have been absorbed in more solid works and therefore did not require reprinting. The *Herakleia* for instance has been absorbed in Mr. Bywater's *Herakleitos*; the *Eratosthenica* by Hiller; the *Callimachea* in O. Schneider's edition; while Bergk's own History of Greek literature contains all that is valuable in the *Recessio* von K. O. Müller's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, the paper *Ueber das älteste Versmass der Griechen*, the *Commentatio de tabula Iliaca Parisiensis*, and the treatises *Ueber die Einheit und Untheilbarkeit des ersten Buches des Ilias* and

Wann beginnt die Alexandrische Periode. Others are now antediluvian, as for instance *das Zeitalter des Babrius*, which argues that Babrius belongs to the Alexandrine period and which has been exploded by Eberhard and Crusius long ago. The review of *der Rüstow-Köchlyschen Geschichte des griechischen Kriegswesen* has no interest since the book reviewed has ceased to be read. Other reviews, however, such as that of Böckh's *Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, and of Meier's *Diäteten* (together with *die Attischen Schiedsrichter*) contain matter which still requires to be read and utilized, e.g. Bergk's lucid and plausible view of the Naucreries. In the paper *Ueber den Amtseid der Attischen Archonten* we have Poll. viii. 86, *ἔμνον δ' οὗτοι πρὸς τῇ βασιλείῳ στοᾷ ἐπὶ τοῦ λίθου ὅφ' ἔ τὰ ταμεία, συμφολλάξεν τοὺς νόμους* emended into *ὅφ' οὐ τὰ νόμα σὺνός, φυλάξεν*. And the *ἀνδρίας χρυσὸς ἰσομέτρητος* which was the fine inflicted on an archon for receiving a bribe is explained by Bergk to mean a figure of gold weighing as much as did the silver with which the archon was bribed. The reprint from the 'Rheinisches Museum' zur *Aristotelischen Politik der Athener* is known to all who are interested in the reforms of Solon. The *Verzeichniss der Siege dramatischer Dichter in Athen* contains an attempt to reverse the common opinion that the results of the dramatic contests at Athens were recorded contemporaneously on stone. The paper *Ueber die Beschränkungen der Freiheit der ältern Komödie* ascribes the restriction of the liberty of comedy to the reactionary religious party at Athens. The most important section in the book is the *Empedoclea*, consisting of reviews of Karsten and Stein, conjectures and a commentary on the Proem—all indispensable to the student of Empedocles. Finally, there remain to be mentioned some emendations of Parmenides, the dissertation of *Aristotelis libello de Xenophane*, another of *Chrysippi libris περὶ ἀποφαιτικῶν*, some *Hermesianactea*, *Theocritea* and *Epicharmea*, papers on *die Aufgabe der Alterthumswissenschaft*, and *die Geburt der Athene*, and some *Miscellanea*.—F. B. JEVONS.

The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes, &c.
By the Rev. J. J. LIAS. (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools.)

THE merits and demerits of this volume are mainly negative. At least its positive merits lie beyond the horizon of a classical review. A clearly and carefully written introduction, good illustrative matter in many of the notes, and a number of well chosen references sending the student to accessible and trustworthy sources for further information, are distinct merits, and will ensure the commentary an extended use. We regret all the more that the strictly exegetical matter must be pronounced disappointing. We much doubt whether a theological student, after going through the epistle with this commentary, will have learnt much of the science of exegesis proper, of that close grappling with the idiom and thought of the Greek text which is the pith and marrow of fruitful study of the New Testament. And, while the notes embody the results of many standard authorities, we miss any reference to much of the best recent work both at home and abroad. For example, we see no trace in these notes of any use of Canon Evans' contribution to the Speaker's commentary. *Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός*; is discussed as though Canon Evans' note had never been written: the much disputed question of *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι* (7. 21) is decided, not, as it ought to be, on philological grounds, but by general considerations on the nature of Christian liberty and the like. Again Canon Evans' brilliant treatment of the N. T. use of *ἴνα* should, if not adopted, at least have

been noticed in the many crucial passages which this epistle contains. In the difficult verse x. 29 *ἵνα* is, apparently without misgiving, rendered 'by what right,' a meaning *ἵνα* surely cannot bear. Throughout, there is a tendency to miss points of scholarship.

More seriously objectionable is the note on vii. 34, *καὶ μεμέρισται*, where Tischendorf is misquoted with the result of misrepresenting his meaning; and Jerome is made to say the opposite of what his words really mean.

We do not then consider Mr. Lias' commentary to have contributed much to exegesis. At the same time it contains, as we have said, much useful illustrative matter, and the notes are invariably clear and concise.—A. R.

Three Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine.
Translated with Analyses by F. H. Woods, B.D., and J. O. JOHNSTON. D. Nutt, 1887. Pp. xxvii. 242. 4s. 6d.

THE three treatises are the *De Spiritu et Littera*, the *De Natura et Gratia*, and the *De Gestis Pelagii*. They form part of the work for the Honour School of Theology at Oxford, and the two editors are both of them Lecturers in Theology, the one at S. John's, the other at Lincoln and Merton. The text adopted is that of the Benedictine edition, deviations from which are generally noted in the margin. This is the second translation of these treatises into English during the last fifteen years. In 1872 they appeared in the translation of the works of S. Augustine then being published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh. That edition of them, made by Dr. Holmes, claimed to be first rendering of them into English. One obvious advantage which the volume before us has over the other two is its convenient size; and another is that it can be bought separately, and does not involve the purchase of several other volumes. A further advantage which it has over its predecessors lies in the careful and full analyses which precede the treatises. But the editors would probably have done well if they had followed Dr. Holmes in giving headings both to the chapters and the pages. Such things coax the listless reader to persevere, and are a real help to the genuine student in finding quickly some topic for which he is hunting. Clearness, however, is gained in another direction by placing the references to Scripture in the margin against the quotation, instead of in a heap at the bottom of the page. But only in a single instance is attention drawn to the difference between Augustine's Latin text and the Vulgate (*provaricationis gratia* for *propter transgressionem* in Gal. iii. 19.) Where Augustine's text allows it, Scripture is given in the words of the A. V.

The translation reads smoothly, and comparison with the original in passages taken at random shows it to be accurate.—A. PLUMMER.

De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin par AD. REGNIER. Paris, Hachette, 1886. 8vo. pp. xviii, 212. 6 fr.

IN the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries France took the lead in Greek and Latin lexicography; witness Budé, H. and R. Estienne, Duange. Didot did much to recover the lost credit of his country, and of late Quicherat, Riemann, and Goelzer (*Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la Latinité de Saint Jérôme*, Paris, Hachette, 1884) have entered into friendly rivalry with Georges, Wölflin, Paucker, Rönisch, and other Germans who have largely enriched our Latin lexicons during the last quarter of a century.

The author declares: 'J'ai lu et relu les textes avec grand soin, et ne crois pas avoir fait de graves omissions, au moins dans les parties qui traitent du vocabulaire, du sens et de la flexion.'

I have carefully gone through the whole book, comparing with different portions one or other of three annotated lexicons, in which, to my own collections, I have added those of Paucker and many others. I have derived from M. Regnier many additional examples, one or two new words. In general where I had already cited the same example, I have found his citation accurate, and can honestly recommend the book to all who are interested in Augustine and his age. It displays an acquaintance with the most recent researches in France and Germany, and will be welcome to Georges, Rönisch, and their fellow-workers.

I proceed to point out some shortcomings. There is no index: to make the book serviceable the reader must be content, as I have been, to transfer its contents to the margin of his lexicon.

I have not examined the references, except by comparing them with my own memoranda; but I have found some passages cited variously in different pages.

Thus (p. 10) *incantare* is not in serm. 52, but (p. 190) in 32; *multiloquium* neither in s. 26 (p. 10), nor yet in 36 (p. 166), but in 56; *propitiare* not in s. 251 (p. 10), but 351 (p. 189); *medullitus* not in § 5 (p. 10), but § 3 (p. 198) of s. 293; *corpulentia* in § 2 (p. 94), not § 1 (p. 103) of s. 214; *conscissio* in s. 56 (p. 168), not 36 (p. 178).

To Terence are ascribed *prostitutio* (p. 10), and *non sum occupatus dare operam amico* (p. 72). The former belongs to Tertullian, the latter to the Truculentus of Plautus, as Georges (whom M. Regnier nowhere cites) informs us. In Georges also may be found *obauditus* (p. 167 'je n'ai trouvé ce mot mentionné nulle part'), and *operator* (Aug. serm. 20 § 4) which is omitted by M. Regnier, as is the Horatian *dilatator* (serm. 40 § 5. Cf. Migne 90 130d). In p. 173 *latura* n.s. is ascribed to 'Juv.', instead of to Juvenal's scholiast (Georges).

Many of the passages cited are no way characteristic of low Latin. Thus p. 19 *ad fin.* 'serm. 2 c. 4 f. solvat mihi quaestionem quam modo proposui.' Cette dernière [phrase] contient même deux verbes, qui, eux aussi, sont là d'un emploi tout français.' They also occur in Quintilian.

Many abstract substantives are erroneously cited, as used anomalously. Thus *admiratio* in serm. 283 c. 3 'invenis aliquando hominem acutissimum, memorem ad incredibilem admirationem.' The word is here taken in the common acceptance; but it is worth while to compare the whole phrase *ad admirationem* (our 'to admiration') with Pliny's *usque in admirationem*.

Velatio, in a different sense from that cited in lexx., occurs s. 300 § 3 'testamentum enim vetus velatio est novi testamenti, et testamentum novum revelatio est veteris testamenti.'

Coronator, cited in lexx. from serm. 318 (§ 3 fin.) occurs also 300 § 6; *lapidator*, only known from Cic. p. domo, s. 49 § 10. 315 § 6. 318 § 1. 382 § 3.

An interesting example of *valet* = *constat* (Fr. 'vaut') occurs s. 37 c. 3 *post med.* 'pretiosi lapides ideo dicti sunt, quia caro valet.' Georges has the same expression from the 'confessions.'

I hope that the publisher may be encouraged to continue the series of monographs on patristic Latin, and to append a complete *index verborum* to each instalment. Even as it is, this book is necessary to every serious student of post-Augustan Latinity. —J. E. B. M.

Chrysostom, a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation, by F. H. CHASE, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge. Bell and Co. 1887. pp. ix, 204.

THIS book is the Kaye Prize Essay of 1883 recast and rewritten. The writer sees many similarities between the difficulties of Chrysostom's age and those of our own. In particular, men's views about the Bible were not those of their predecessors. New methods of interpretation were transforming the old system, not only for scholars but for the multitude; for the results of criticism at once became public property through the popular expositions of the preacher. The Apologist, freed from his task of defending the faith, turned to the nobler work of expounding it. The struggle with Gnosticism showed the necessity of determining the contents of the New Testament: the struggle with Arianism showed the necessity of interpreting the contents of the whole Bible. And thus 'Chrysostom as a preacher is before all things the Interpreter of Scripture,' and in his hands the Bible became 'the manual of the Controversialist.'

The five chapters of the Essay are on the following topics:—The School of Antioch and Chrysostom's place in it: Chrysostom as an Interpreter of the Old Testament; as Critic and Scholar; as an Interpreter of the Gospels and the Acts; as an Interpreter of St. Paul's Epistles. Most of these chapters represent a large amount of self-denying work; work which at times must have been somewhat tedious, and which does not make a great deal of show, but which yields valuable results at the cost of very little trouble to those who care to profit by what Mr. Chase has done for them. How much reading, for instance, is implied in the 'four main Canons of Interpretation,' which he has formulated as 'implied in Chrysostom's treatment of the Prophetic Books' (p. 69); or in the tabulated specimens of Chrysostom's treatment of the Greek Article, the Genitive, the Particles, the Prepositions, &c., and of his discussions of Etymologies, Synonyms, and the like. Here, again, is a useful piece of work:—

'Chrysostom's comparative silence on the subject of variations of reading seems to be an indication that he regarded the question of text as authoritatively settled. His archiepiscopate at Constantinople gave a quasi-formal sanction in that metropolis of Christianity to the traditions and decisions of the Antiochenes. Hence the importance of his position in regard to the history of the text of the New Testament. I propose briefly to discuss passages where S. Chrysostom (1) notices a variation of reading, or (2) a variation of punctuation; or (3) adopts a reading to which for some reason interest attaches' (p. 83).

This proposal is carried out, and then Mr. Chase thus sums up the result.

'A review of Chrysostom's relation to textual questions appears to warrant three inferences:—(1) The rarity of any direct discussion on a matter of reading seems to confirm the theory that some authoritative settlement of the text had taken place; (2) the character of the few discussions we have noticed shews that the typical Antiochene teacher took surface plausibility as the standard of excellence; (3) the survival of curious Pre-Syrian readings, sometimes early traditional readings, oftener Western, may suggest the conclusion that the Antiochene recension was but recent in Chrysostom's time' (p. 89).

All this will be very unwelcome to those who agree with the author of *The Revision Revised* that the Syrian revision of the text of the New Testament is a mere fiction, and that the so-called *textus receptus*, to which Chrysostom's text closely approximates, is on the whole a very pure one. But those who are

already convinced that the reverse of this is the truth will be grateful to Mr. Chase for the evidence which he has collected for them in confirmation of what has already been established or rendered probable. The volume is a useful one from various points of view: and students may be grateful to the University of Cambridge for selecting this subject for the Kaye Prize and to Mr. Chase for the way in which he has treated it.—ALFRED PLUMMER.

Epochs of Church History. The Church of the Early Fathers (external history), by ALFRED PLUMMER, D. D. Master of University College, Durham. London. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

THE substance of Dr. Plummer's little work is excellent. It is carefully written, takes full account of recent research, and everywhere shows traces of wider reading. It is also provided with full chronological tables and lists of books which are likely to be useful to the student. I think, however, that in the arrangement of the work there is room for improvement. The general account of the churches as a whole and of their relations to the state is reserved for the last chapter, nearly two-thirds of what precedes being devoted to a formal series of histories of churches and their bishops, all duly traced down to the year 312. As the special histories are seriously cramped by the want of this information, would it not be better if, in a future edition, what is now the last chapter were placed immediately after the first?—H. M. G.

THREE BOOKS OF TRAVEL IN GREECE.

Rambles and Studies in Greece, by J. P. MAHAFFY; third edition, revised and enlarged. Macmillan. 1887. 10s. 6d.

Griechische Reise; Blätter aus dem Tagebuche einer Reise in Griechenland und in der Türkei; von KARL KRUMBACHER. Berlin. Hettler. 1886. 7 mk.

An Easter Vacation in Greece; by J. E. SANDYS. Macmillan. 1887. 3s. 6d.

THE appearance of a third edition of Professor Mahaffy's *Rambles and Studies in Greece* is a gratifying proof of the keen interest which the present generation takes in that country—a result to which this book, in all probability, has not a little contributed. Professor Mahaffy is a wit, a man of the world, and a many-sided observer, as well as a widely read scholar; and the quickness of his imagination, while it often invests with a poetical charm the objects which he describes, never betrays him into adopting groundless fancies. He has also many original ideas to communicate, and in expounding these, whether he persuades us or not, is always interesting. In describing the scope of his work he says—'My aim is to bring the living features of Greece home to the student, by connecting them, as far as possible, with the facts of older history, which are so familiar to most of us. I shall also have a good deal to say about the modern politics of Greece, and the character of the modern population.' Nothing could be better than this; and such a view accounts for his oft-repeated admiration for Byron's poetry, which has invested the country from both these points of view with a brilliant attractiveness. The present edition is a considerable expansion of the original work. Chapters on Olympia, and on Arcadia and the temple at Bassae, were inserted in the second edition, and to these is now added an account of Sparta and Messenia. His route from Argos to Sparta was the unfamiliar but beautiful one through the district of Kynuria by Hagios Petros;

and, in passing, we may recommend to future travellers who follow his footsteps to make the ascent of the neighbouring summit of Mount Parnon, which, from its neighbourhood to the incomparable chain of Taygetus, and from its dominating the whole of the eastern Peloponnese and a vast expanse of sea, ought to present one of the finest panoramas in Greece. The following passage, describing early morning in the valley of Sparta, is characteristic of the writer, and none but a very skilled hand could have held so exactly the balance between the sublime and the ridiculous.

'On opening my window, I felt that I had attained one of the strange moments of life which can never be forgotten. The air was preternaturally clear and cold, and the sky beginning to glow faintly with the coming day. Straight before me, so close that it almost seemed within reach of voice, the giant Taygetus, which rises straight from the plain, stood up into the sky, its black and purple gradually brightening into crimson, and the cold blue-white of its snow warming into rose. There was a great feeling of peace and silence, and yet a vast diffusion of sound. From the whole plain, with all its home-steads and villages, myriads of cocks were proclaiming the advent of dawn. I had never thought there were so many cocks in all the world. The ever succeeding voices of these countless thousands kept up one continual wave of crowing, such as I suppose cannot be equalled anywhere else in the world; and yet for all that, as I have said, there was a feeling of silence, a sense that no other living thing was abroad, an absolute stillness in the air, a deep sleep over the rest of nature.'

The principal object which M. Krumbacher had in visiting the Aegean was the laudable one of examining the two MSS. of Julius Romanos, 'the greatest Christian hymn-writer,' which exist in the library of the monastery of St. John at Patmos. So important are these, that whereas Cardinal Pitra, on the strength of all that could be gleaned in Europe of Romanos' hymns, only edited twenty-nine, in Patmos there are over ninety. Of these M. Krumbacher, in the course of two visits to that island, made a complete study. He also devoted himself to the modern Greek language and its dialects, on which subject he is an authority, but the scientific results of his investigations he proposes to publish elsewhere, and meanwhile in the present volume he gives us the narrative of his journey. This comprised visits to Athens and Constantinople, and, on the continent of Asia Minor, to Ephesus and Tralles, to Magnesia and Sardis, and to Pergamon; but the greater part of his time was devoted to the Asiatic Greek islands—Rhodes, Leros, Patmos, Samos, Chios, and Lesbos. We wish we could say it is an interesting book. If M. Krumbacher had only remembered that the half—we might really say in this instance, the quarter—is more than the whole, and had given us 100 pages instead of 400, it would have been well worth reading; but, as it is, the most patient reader becomes exhausted by the constant recurrence of coffee-drinking, and bargaining, and interviews with officials, and other everyday occurrences, which can only be interesting to the person who experienced them. This is the more provoking, because M. Krumbacher was in many ways an excellent traveller. He observed carefully and with discrimination; his knowledge of the modern Greek language enabled him to communicate with those among whom he was thrown; and he had the great merit of possessing a strong sympathy for the people whom he visited, and especially for the lower classes. He is at his best when he narrates a

conversation between the islanders, which he overheard during a wakeful night on the deck of a vessel, on the subject of the animosities caused by the introduction of a diving apparatus among the sponge-fishers of those regions; or when he describes the difficulty of faithfully taking down popular songs from recitation, owing to the disposition of the people to 'correct' a dialectic form, if asked to repeat it, and the more serious risk of rough treatment, when he attempted to commit sailors' songs to writing; or when he relates from his own observation the custom of the children at Smyrna of singing the 'swallow-song' (*χελιδόνισμα*). It is also to his credit that he everywhere made diligent enquiries with regard to education, so that in the city of Rhodes we find him visiting the Jewish as well as the Greek school. Here and there we are able to pick up crumbs of scientific information, which he has let drop from what we doubt not is an ample store: thus he tells us that in the dialect of Chios he found peculiarities of pronunciation, which previously had been thought to belong only to the dialects of Cyprus and Trebizond; and in another place we learn that Sakellion, the former librarian of Patmos, has made a careful catalogue of that valuable library, though as yet it is unpublished. As regards the burning question of the modern language, his views are hostile to the learned idiom, but he thinks the reaction in favour of the spoken language has come too late, because the classical forms and constructions that have been introduced have become predominant. He justly observes that, whereas in other languages, when new ideas were introduced, new words were invented for them, in Modern Greek an immense number of words for ideas that had not before been entertained were all at once imported from ancient Greek, which was to all intents a different language; and whereas borrowed words elsewhere have been assimilated in form to the language into which they have been adopted, in Modern Greek not only were they introduced unchanged, but the old forms were assimilated to them.

Mr. Sandys' unpretending and pleasantly written little book contains an account of a month spent in Greece by the author and his wife during the spring

of last year, in the course of which they visited Athens and the principal places of interest in Attica, the Argive plain and its ancient sites, Corinth, Delphi, and Olympia. Some of the connecting points between these are also noticed, among which we may especially mention the Isthmian Stadium, a place not much noticed, though it lies near the beaten track. In the notes references are given to collections of inscriptions and other learned works which may be serviceable to the student after his return home, and quotations are introduced from the classics, which illustrate such points as are from time to time suggested by such a journey. Among these we remark that Mr. Sandys agrees with Professor Mahaffy in his estimate of that disenchanting plant, the asphodel: of this he says—'It will grow almost anywhere in waste places; so that the 'mead of asphodel,' in which Homer's heroes are described as pacing to and fro in the unseen world, would seem to imply a barren waste where other plants would hardly grow, and may perhaps find its closest parallel in the forlorn and desolate region which Virgil calls the *loca senta situ*' (p. 102; cp. Mahaffy, p. 392). At the end of the volume are two appendices, one of which contains a *catalogue raisonné* of books on Greek travel and subjects connected with it, the other a time-table of the numerous steamers which ply between the ports of Greece. A careful study of the latter of these will enable persons before leaving England to arrange their tours beforehand; and by the help of these means of transit such travellers as are content with passing glimpses may now reach comparatively remote places, such as the islands of Melos, Amorgos, and Scyros, and can be brought within range of some of the finest scenery in Greece, such as that in the neighbourhood of the Maliae and Pagasæan gulfs. If we are to believe the travelling servants of Athens, the days of extended tours in Greece are at an end, and their place is taken by short and rapid excursions which are rendered easy by the increased facilities for locomotion. The change appears an inevitable one, however much we may regret it, and those who are contented with the second best course will find in this volume much that is suggestive for their purpose.

H. F. TOZER.

NOTES.

THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN LATIN.

[To save time, the following remarks of Mr. Sonnenschein were forwarded to Mr. Roby, who has added the notes appended.]

THERE are two points in Mr. Roby's criticism of my paper on which I may perhaps be permitted to say a few words:

Without implication.

Present time ... (1) Si ita facit, errat ...
Past time ... (2) Si ita faciebat (fecit), errabat (erravit) ...
Future time ... (3) Si ita faciet (fecerit), errabit (erraverit) ...

With implication.

(4) Si ita faceret, erraret [but he is not doing (does not do) so].
 (5) Si ita fecisset, erravisset [but he did not do so].
 (6) Si ita faciat, erret [but I do not say he will do so].

The points at issue may be summed up by saying that I consider that (6) corresponds to (3). Mr. Roby considers that in ordinary cases (6) corresponds to (1);¹ and he distinguishes (4) from (6) by saying

¹ I must refer to my own words in § 1507, as at once more full and precise.—H. J. R.

(A) The normal use of the Present, as distinct from the Imperfect, Subjunctive.

(B) The meaning of such a sentence as *Erat unum iter, Nerdam si reverti vellent, alterum si Tarracensem peterent*.

(A) My scheme of the ordinary use of moods and tenses in Conditional sentences would stand thus:

that (6) expresses an action supposed to occur (momentary act),² (4) an action supposed to be (or have been) already occurring (continuous state).³ This I

² I have not said this. But it would have been better if I had added the words 'or state' to 'action' in § 1530a.—H. J. R.

³ 'Or action'.—H. J. R.

infer to be the meaning of § 1530. Mr. Roby criticises my terminology in regard to (6): 'Future condition with reserve.' All that I meant by 'reserve,' was an implication warning the reader not to suppose the writer means that the condition will be fulfilled. I think there is a palpable difference between a protasis with such an implication and a protasis with no implication at all; between 'if he were to do it [I do not say he will]' and 'if he does (shall do) it.'¹

Mr. Roby's formula for (4) 'if he had been doing it, he would have been making a mistake (cf. § 1518 f.) is certainly convenient as covering two senses of the Imperfect: my only objection to it is that it does not give sufficient prominence to the fact (as to which I am glad to find that I am in accord with Mr. Roby) that in the large majority of instances in the classical period, the tense refers to what is called present time: i.e. to the time denoted by the Present Indicative. In Plautus the tense refers to the past far more commonly: whether in such cases it always denotes 'continued action in the past,' I think doubtful.

(B) 'There was one road, if they wanted to return to Ilerda, another if they were to go to Tarraco.' How does Mr. Roby deal with such a sentence as this?² His §§ 1566—1570 (conditions qualifying an infinitive, future participle or gerundive) do not cover it; it would therefore seem that he regards it as falling

¹ There is a difference between pres. subj. and fut. ind. The former is used of an action thereby indicated as not real; the latter has no implication. If Prof. Sonnenschein means this, I agree.—H. J. R.

² This sentence implies a suppressed apodosis. See § 1750 a-c. The condition does not qualify *erat iter*. There was a road in any case. The word *habendum* or the like, or *quod haberent*, would be the proper apodosis to *si...vellet* &c. H. J. R.

[It may not be unacceptable to some of our readers to have the main points in this discussion laid distinctly before them. It will be remembered that the four propositions condemned in Mr. Sonnenschein's original paper were (1) that the Ind. in the protasis implies reality, (2) that the Pres. Subj. implies possibility, (3) that the Imp. Subj. refers primarily to the past, (4) that the Imp. Subj. in Latin is the equivalent of the Greek Optative (*si quid haberet, daret* = *εἰ τι ἔχοι δίδωσι δύν*). Both disputants are agreed as to (1), (2), (4); even as to (3) both allow that the Imp. Subj. is used with reference both to present and to past time, and that it more often refers to the present than to the past; but while Mr. Sonnenschein speaks of the latter usage as exceptional in the writers of the best age, Mr. Roby treats this as the normal, and the other as the secondary use. The point is somewhat subtle, but the following reasons incline me to side with Mr. Roby in his contention. There is a *prima facie* probability that any special use of a tense will have its starting-point in the general meaning of the tense; hence it is probable that the Imp. Subj. of the hypothetical sentence had, to begin with, a reference to a continued action or state in the past; and this probability is confirmed by the fact mentioned by Mr. Sonnenschein, that in the oldest Latin writings the reference to the past is more common than in Cicero and later authors. Mr. Roby's excellent distinction that 'the Imp. Subj. is used in these sentences when you contemplate the present as the resultant of the past, and the Pres. Subj. used when you contemplate the present as the starting-point of the future,' enables us to see how naturally the tense, which properly denotes a con-

tinuous past, gets to include present time as well; and this is illustrated by the use of the Greek Imp. Ind. with *ἄν* and our own 'would have,' in such a sentence as that quoted by Mr. Sonnenschein, 'If I had not been Alexander I would fain have been Diogenes.' In what respect does this differ from 'If I were not Alexander I would fain be Diogenes'? Surely only in the fact that, while both refer to present time, the former views the present as a consequence of the past, the latter regards it in itself without looking back to the past; and thus the former comes to imply the impossibility of the hypothetical case, the contrary being supposed already fixed unchangeably. We may translate both *si ego rex sim* and *si ego rex essem* by the words 'if I were King'; but, while the former simply implies 'as I am not,' the latter has the further implication 'as I never can be.' I do not think this implication can ever have been absent from the mind of a Roman, when he used the Imp. Subj., because, however far a word or phrase may depart from its original use, yet until the old use has become entirely obsolete, it is impossible for the new use to be unaffected by it. The Greek aorist got to be used with a present force in such phrases as *τί οὐκ ἐπύθορας*; *ἐπύθεσθαι*, but it carried with it the quality of instantaneousness—no sooner said than done. It would seem then that we cannot accept Mr. Sonnenschein's symmetrical scheme of tenses. Not only is the Imp. used with reference both to past and to present time, but the Pres. also is used both of a future which is already beginning, and, as Mr. Sonnenschein allows, of present time without reference to a future, as in *N.D. iii. 79, nam si current (di homines), bene bonis sit, male malis; quod nunc*

³ The subj. implies that neither alternative was then actually adopted, but nothing more. It denotes an imaginary, not a real, action.—H. J. R.

⁴ In both cases the subj. by itself denotes nothing more than the non-actuality of the action or state.—H. J. R.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

abest. I think therefore that the true scheme of hypothetical tenses would give at least two to each time, *faciat* and *faceret* to the present, *faceret* and *fecisset* to the past, *faciat* and *facturus sit* to the future.

There are other points which might invite discussion, e.g. the criticism of Prof. Goodwin's view of the conditional forms in Greek, and the use of the subjunctive in auxiliary verbs. Something may be said on these in a future number of the *Review*, but there is just one slight point which may be noticed here. Mr. Sonnenschein protests against the combination of *should* and *would* in such a phrase as 'If he should do it, it would be well,' holding that the proper phrase is 'If he were to do it'; but there are many cases in which 'should' is more appropriate than 'were to,' e.g. 'If it should appear that you were present on that occasion, it would be very awkward for you,' 'If you should be going to town that day, you would find him at his office,' 'If he should come in whilst you were there, what excuse would you make?'—J. B. M.]

ON SOPH. *Electr.* 564, AND EUR. *I. T.* 15 AND 35. —In the second *ἑκείσθων* of Sophocles' *Electra* Clytaemnestra has arraigned Agamemnon in a set speech for the sacrifice of Iphigenia and has challenged Electra to justify his deed: *δίδαξον δὲ με τοῦ χάριν τίνων ἔθυσεν αὐτήν*. Electra in her reply meets this challenge with a counter-question, vv. 563 sq.

ἔρου δὲ τὴν κυραγὸν Ἀρτεμιν τίνος
ποιῶνς τὰ πολλὰ πνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι.

These lines are explained by Hermann to mean 'ask Artemis why she restrained the frequent winds at Aulis'; and indeed I do not see what other meaning can be wrung from the Greek: Mr. Jebb has rightly abandoned his former interpretation by which *ὁ πατήρ*, that is Agamemnon, was imported from so far away as the *πατέρα* of v. 558 to oust the intervening *Ἀρτεμιν* as the subject of *ἔσχε*. But Hermann's explanation, inexorably demanded by the words, is disastrous to the sense. Artemis did not restrain the winds at Aulis: had she done so, Agamemnon might have laughed her to scorn and Iphigenia would never have been sacrificed. To the ships of the heroic age and the age of Sophocles alike, a calm was no hindrance: they were equipped with oars. What it was that kept the fleet at Aulis we know very well from Aesch. *Ag.* 202 sqq. and fifty other sources; we know that it was not a calm, but contrary winds. I am aware that Ovid in *met.* XIII 183 has blundered into the phrase '*nulla aut contraria classi flamina erant*,' but that is in an opus mediis incudibus ablatum: emendaturus, si licuisset, erat. The question to ask of Artemis will then, I think, be this:

τίνος
ποιῶνς τὰ πλοῖα πνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι

why gales detained the fleet at Aulis. Had we before us the series of MSS. by which the text was handed down, we should probably find that the inversion of two consecutive letters, a most frequent error, first changed *πλοῖα* to *πολιά*; this once done, the difference between *λι* and *λλ* is so evanescent that the further corruption *πολλά* scarcely merits the name of a change.

Misled by this passage, Hermann and others have endeavoured to introduce by conjecture a reference to this imaginary calm into Eur. *I. T.* 15. These conjectures I do not propose to discuss, as they seem to be put out of court by the considerations already

adduced; but the verse is a celebrated crux and will perhaps repay examination. The passage vv. 10.-16 runs thus:

10 ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δὴ χιλίων ρῶν στόλον
Ἑλληνικὸν συνήγαγ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ
τὸν καλλίδικον στέφανον Ἴλιου θέλων
λαβεῖν Ἀχαιοῖς, τοὺς θ' ὑβρισθέντας γάμους
Ἑλένης μετελθεῖν, Μενέλεω χάριν φέρων.
15 δεινὴς τ' ἀπλοῖας πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων
εἰς ἔμπυρ' ἦλθε, καὶ λέγει Κάλχας τάδε·

There is only one way of construing v. 15 so as to make sense: *δεινὴς ἀπλοῖας* must be genitive absolute: 'as there was a dreadful impossibility of sailing and as he found the wind unfavourable.' But it is first of all apparent that *δέ*, not *τε*, is the conjunction demanded at the beginning of the verse; so Barnes, followed almost universally, alters *τ'* to *δ'*. Next, the ambiguity of the language is found unpardonable: the reader is inevitably led to construe *ἀπλοῖας*, like *πνευμάτων*, with *οὐ τυγχάνων*; a construction which he then discovers to make nonsense of the passage. Hence the verse has been assailed by a host of conjectures, for the most part very unscientific; indeed the only one which seems to deserve mention is Madvig's. He proposes simply *δεινὴ δ' ἀπλοῖα*: the co-ordination of the causal dative with the causal participle is of course quite correct and natural. But the assumed error is not easily explicable: although *δέ* and *τε* are often enough confused, and although you might find here and there an instance of dative and genitive inflexions exchanged through sheer carelessness, still we can hardly postulate with prudence the occurrence of both mistakes together. And what is worse, we still have not rid the line of a third flaw pointed out by Badham: the flatness of the epithet *δεινὴ* might be tolerated by an indulgent schoolmaster in the verses of a beginner, but in this prince of rhetoricians it is surprising. The line is not emended till all three faults, of connexion, of construction, and of diction, are extirpated; and the sagacity of Badham told us years ago to look for the root of the evil in the letters *δεινὴς τ'*. And there, sure enough, we find it. The letters *δ-ει-νηστ* are the letters *νηστ-ει-δ*; and here, I fancy, is the hand of Euripides:

νήσται δ' ἀπλοῖα πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων
εἰς ἔμπυρ' ἦλθε.

The attraction of *ἀπλοῖα* into the case of *δεινὴς* is an error which has abundant examples and may almost be called inevitable. We know that famine was, as might be expected, the chief suffering of the weather-bound fleet; and in fact Euripides is here giving a verbal reproduction of the account in Aesch. *Ag.* 193 sqq. *εὐτ' ἀπλοῖα κενάγγει βαρύνοντ' Ἀχαιῆδες* λέως . . . πνοαὶ δ' ἀπὸ Στυμφώνος μολῶσαι, κακόσχολοι, νῆσι τιδ'ες, δόσσορμιοι . . . κατέβαινον ἄνθος Ἀργείων.

Transpositions of letters and syllables such as I have here assumed are naturally regarded by many as *a priori* improbable. The fact that they are frequent is well known to the alert and diligent student of Greek and Latin MSS.; and the confusion of mind or eye which begets them has survived the introduction of printing: on p. 156 of vol. I of *The Classical Review* will be found such corrigenda to Holder's Herodotus as *ταῦτα* for *ταυτα*, *ἐστρατεύετο* for *αἰεστρεύετο*, the latter a curiously apt parallel. It is impossible here to illustrate this subject as it might be illustrated and as I hope some day to illustrate it; but there occurs in this same *πρόλογος* a crux perhaps yet more notorious than v. 15, where

I seem to detect a similar cause at work. Iphigenia relates how Artemis bore her away from Aulis to the land of the Tauri—

ναοῖσι δ' ἐν τοῖσδ' ἱερὰν τίθησιν με,
35 ὅθεν νόμοισι, τοῖσιν ἤδεται θεά
Ἄρτεμις, ἑορτῆς, τοῖσιν ἤς καλὸν μόνον
τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῇ τῇν θεὸν φοβουμένη.
θῶα γὰρ, ὅντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει,
ὅς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἑλλὰν ἀντήρ.

So reads the best MS. Now we have here beginning with v. 35 a sentence which gets no further than the three words ὅθεν νόμοισιν ἑορτῆς: there is a relative clause subjoined to νόμοισιν by τοῖσιν; there is another relative clause subjoined to ἑορτῆς by ἤ: at the end of this clause we come to a full stop, and begin an entirely new sentence introduced by an inferential particle. The heroes who undertake the defence of the text say that we have here an aposiopesis. Aposiopesis is a comforting word; but the sphere of the figure so named is limited by conditions which here preclude it. In cases of aposiopesis it is requisite that we should be able to form a notion how the speaker was about to complete the sentence which he breaks off: this is obviously necessary to the understanding of the situation, because it is the thought of the suppressed words which causes to arise in his mind the emotion which restrains him from uttering them. But here the spoken part of the sentence consists only of three words, and we cannot tell the meaning of the first or the construction of the second: we cannot tell whether ὅθεν means *since which time* or *for which reason*; we cannot tell whether the inflexion of νόμοισιν means *with* or *by* or *in* or *for* or *to* or *because of*: much less then can we guess how the sentence would proceed. Hence this reading is now defended, I think, by no scholar of repute: a few have tried to mend matters by eliciting τοῖσιν from the τοῖσι of the second-best MS. in v. 35. We do indeed thus get a sentence, with ἤδεται for its principal verb; but sense is as far off as ever. The sacrifices, as the words ὅντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει inform us, were instituted, not upon the arrival of Iphigenia, but long before; and there is no imaginable way in which Artemis' delight in them can have been caused by anything recounted in the narrative which has preceded. Therefore other conjectures have been proposed, of which I mention Weil's as the most ingenious and plausible. He retains τοῖσιν, strikes out Ἄρτεμις as a gloss on θεά, and replaces it by χράμεσθ'. This, to be sure, is good sense; yet the hypothesis is precarious. The officiousness of the scribe is surely excessive and not complimentary to our intelligence: what goddess but Artemis could we dream of? Again how often θεά and ἡ θεός recur in this play for Artemis I do not waste time in counting, but it is very often indeed; yet nowhere else has the scribe importuned us with the explanation. I prefer then to look for light to the ductus litterarum; and I will suggest that if there once stood in the text the letters ΝΟΜΟΙΣΙΝΘΕΝΟΙΟΙΣΙΝ it required only the inversion of the two consecutive letters NE, and the infinitesimally slight change of T for I, to produce ΝΟΜΟΙΣΙΝΘΕΝ ΤΟΙΣΙΝ; and that the only way to make metre of this was to arrange the words as they now stand in the MS., ὅθεν νόμοισι τοῖσιν. But the sentence

νόμοισι τῷ δδνελοισιν ἤδεται θεά
Ἄρτεμις ἑορτῆς

where Artemis delights in strange rites is surely just what is wanted; and it is curious to note how closely van Herwerden has approached to this sense with his conjecture *θεον νόμοισι ἀποσιπῶν*.—A. E. HOUSMAN.

AISCHYLOS, *Agamemnon*, 1227—1230.

νεῶν τ' ἑπαρχος Ἰλίου τ' ἀναστάτης
οὐκ οἶδεν οἷα γλῶσσα μισητῆς κυνὸς
λέξασα κἀκτείνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην
ἔτης λαθραίου τεύχεται κακῇ τύχῃ (1230).

This passage has exercised the ingenuity of scholars and many clever emendations have been proposed: nevertheless I believe that the MSS. reading (which I give with the exception of κἀκτείνασα, the inevitable correction of the irrelevant καὶ κτείνασα) gives better sense than any reading that has been suggested.

It is to be observed that Cassandra utters her prophetic revelations in two forms. She first in her lyrical laments perplexes the chorus with ἐπάργματα θέσφατα (1072—1177), a series of dark pictures, drawn with a few quick strokes; but then she unveils the oracle (1178) and presents to the puzzled elders the same pictures, but painted in more detail and brought into more intelligible connexion. It is important to note that the general order of the prophecies delivered in iambs is the same as that of the lyrical utterances, and that the correspondence is emphasised by the repetition of the same or similar words. Compare for example 1087 with 1186, 1093 with 1185, 1095 seqq. with 1217 seqq., &c. Thus φαιδρόνους (1229) may suggest λουτροῖσι φαιδρόνους in 1109.

Now in 1115—17 we find the remarkable conception of the net; ἡ δίκτυον τι λῖθου; ἀλλ' ἔρκυς ἡ ξένωνος, ἡ ξυναῖτια φόβου, which is plainly a covert reference to the ἀπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον which Klytaimnestra afterwards describes (1382). We might expect that Cassandra would again refer to the net in her unveiled oracle, which is intended to explain the obscurities of her former words. I would suggest that there is such a reference in the present passage and that the word δίκην was an old word for 'net', 'casting-net', being closely connected with δίκτυον and related to δεικνῶν as βάλος is related to βάλλω. The meaning then will be: 'He knoweth not what words the tongue of the lewd hound will speak and how having stretched out with blithe soul a net of stealthy ruin she will succeed therein (in achieving the ruin) with an ill success.' After οἷα it was unnecessary to express ὅς with ἐκτείνασα; and there is no difficulty in understanding κύων from the preceding κυνός.

In support of this interpretation I would further remark that in l. 1611 there may well be a suggestion of the secondary sense of δίκην: ἰδόντα τοῦτον τῆς δίκης ἐν ἔρκεσιν. Moreover the phrase δίκην ἔτης λαθραίου has a close parallel in a passage in the *Prometheus*, 1077:

κοῦκ ἐξαίφνης οὐδὲ λαθραῖως
εἰς ἀπέραντον δίκτυον ἔτης
ἐμπλεχθήσεσθ' ὅπ' ἀνοίας.¹

AISCHYLOS *Agamemnon*, 1310. τὸ δ' ὕψι θυμάτων ἐφροσίν. Does not the Chorus in these words intend to suggest *θυ-έτης*?—J. B. BURY.

EURIPIDES, *Orestes*, 399.

M. τί χρέμα πάσχεις; τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος;
O. ἡ σύνεσις ὅτι σύννοια δειν' εἰργασμένος.
M. πῶς φῆς; σοφὸν τοι τὸ σαφές, οὐ τὸ μὴ σαφές.
O. λύπη μάλιστα γ' ἡ διαφθείρουσά με.
M. δεινὴ γὰρ ἡ θεός τ', ἀλλ' ὁμοῖος ἰσμός. (399)

The reading of the MSS. in 399 cannot be right. For (1) it is extremely unlikely that Euripides would

¹ ἐμπλεχθήσεσθ' made me entertain for a moment the idea of reading πλέξασα for λέξασα in *Agamemnon* 1229; but there is no reason to change the MSS. reading. Nevertheless if Aeschylus wrote πλέξασα the proximity of γλῶσσα would inevitably cause it to be corrupted to λέξασα.

speak of *λύπη* as a goddess, and (2) *ἡ θεός* is quite incongruous with *ἰάσιμος*. Of these objections the first is serious, and the second is fatal to *ἡ θεός*. Weill proposed to read *ἡ σήψ*, a reading which not only introduces an unlikely word but departs altogether from the MSS. I venture to propose that the right reading is

δεινὴ γὰρ ἦθος ἀλλ' ὕμνος ἰάσιμος.

ἦθος is used by medical writers of the character or nature of a disease, and is consequently appropriate here.—J. B. BURY.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA OF THE PLUTUS. —
(1) Dübner, p. 324b. ll. 17–22.

3. τὸ ἦν ἀπόστροφον λαμβάνει, ὃ ἔστιν ἀντίστροφον. ἔστι δὲ ὥστερ καὶ ἄλλως τοῖναντίον δρᾶν καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἀντίστροφον δέχεται. ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἐναντίον δρᾶν. ἡ δὲ ἀπόστροφος ἀντίστροφος καλεῖται. Ἀρίσταρχος γὰρ τοῦτο σημειοῦται. ὃ ἔστιν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀπόστροφος, ἀντίστροφος αὐτῷ καλεῖται. This has no meaning as it stands, or when it purports to be a scholium upon the *ἦν* in the lines

ἦν γὰρ τὰ βέλτισθ' ὁ θεράπων λέξας τύχη,

δόξῃ δὲ μὴ δρᾶν ταῦτα τῷ κεκτημένῳ,

5. μετέχειν ἀνάγκῃ τὸν θεράποντα τῶν κακῶν.

It contains, however, as kernel a real ancient *σχόλιον* from the school of Aristarchus. It is an explanation of a critical mark by Aristarchus, and represents the master's way of taking *μὴ δρᾶν* in l. 4. It has nothing to do with *ἦν* in the previous line. Perhaps the earliest form of the note was τὸ χ' τοῦτο γὰρ ἀντίστροφον δέχεται: ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἐναντίον δρᾶν. The master's critical mark *χ* is possibly concealed in the *καί* before *τοῦτο*, or the *καί* may be due to the compiler of the scholia in their present shape who often thus sweeps together into one note different ways of saying the same thing. In any case the first part of the scholium is also a corrupted explanation of the mark used by Aristarchus, perhaps the explanation of another pupil, viz. τὸ μὴ ἀντίστροφον λαμβάνει: ἔστι δὲ ὥστερ καὶ ἄλλως τοῖναντίον δρᾶν. 'He (the master) takes *μὴ* as reversing the sense; it is as also might be said in another way to do the reverse.' The words Ἀρίσταρχος γὰρ τοῦτο σημειοῦται make still another distinct ancient note, while the *ἡ δὲ ἀπόστροφος ἀντίστροφος καλεῖται* and the closing words are later additions.

(2) On the *θεσπιφδεῖν* of l. 9 the Ravenna MS. has what seems to be a like ancient scholium. *• τυμολογεῖ θεσπιφδεῖν. . . ἀρα τὴν θέμιν ἐκεῖ τὰς μαντείας ἄγειν.* (cp. Dübner, p. 325a. ll. 44–46). This ought to be emended thus: *ἐτυμολογεῖ θεσπιφδεῖν παρὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν θέμιν ἐκεῖ τὰς μαντείας ἄδειν.* 'He (the master) gives as the derivation of *θεσπιφδεῖν* that at Delphi he (Apollo) chants (*ἄδειν*) his prophecies in accord with justice (*θέμις*).'

(3) l. 66 on *ῶ τᾶν*, ἀπαλλάχθρον ἀμ' ἐμοῦ the Ravenna MS. has preserved another note of Aristarchus' school. . . ὅτι οὐ πρὸς ἓνα μόνον τὸ *ῶ τᾶν*, ἀλλὰ πρὸς δύο. The three obliterated letters are best replaced by τὸ *χ*. 'The *χ* because the *ῶ τᾶν* is addressed not to one only but to two.'

(4) The genesis of the unintelligible parts of the scholia is well illustrated by the Ravenna scholium on l. 74.

νῇ τοὺς θεοὺς ἡμεῖς γ', ἐὰν βούλῃ γε σύ.

It is as follows:—*ἐὰν ἰδοῦ ἀπολύομεν· τοῦτο δὲ φασιν ἀπολύσαντες αὐτόν.* This is really an explanation of the closing words of the next line—

A. μέθεσθ' νῦν μου πρῶτον. B. ἦν, μεθίμεν.

The other MSS. have gone still further astray as may be seen by reading Dübner, p. 328b. ll. 45–52.

(5) An editor's critical mark is lost in a scholium on *μαρώτατε ἀνδρῶν* in l. 78. (Dübner, 329a. l. 27) *ὅτι ἐν σχήματι ἀνδρῶν ἐφάνη ὁ Πλούτος.*

(6) We may be sure that the lost critical mark in a scholium on *ὅσους* in l. 137 was Aristarchean, *ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ θυμᾶσαι τὸ θύειν.* There is not the same certainly in either of the following—

(7) l. 169 *Κορινθίας· δηλοῖ ὡς ἀπὸ Λαίδος· Κορινθία γὰρ ἦν.* 'He (the master) explains how it comes from *Lais*; for she was of Corinth'; or

(8) on l. 151 *οὐδὲ προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν· ὅτι οὐ μόνον οὐ προσδιαλέγονται, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὁρᾶσι σχεδόν.* (mark) 'that not only do they not accost them, but almost do not even look at them.'

(9) An Aristarchean note may, however, be recovered from two scholia on l. 155, (see Dübner, p. 331b. l. 42) τὸ *χ* ὅτι ἀρσενικῶς ὁ πόρνος καὶ θηλυκῶς· *ἐπείσθω δὲ εἰ καὶ οὐδεντέρως.*

(10) A few lines above (p. 331b. ll. 27–30) a convincing emendation results from reading *αἰδοῖον* for *ἄστοπον*, converting the following accusative into the genitive, and the verb *ἐπισείειν* into the substantive *ἐπίσειον*. The *οὐ* before *σφόδρα* in the MSS. is then explained.—W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

CAES. B. G. iv. 17. THE BRIDGE OVER THE RHINE, (above, p. 168, 9).—I have always taken the *fibulae* to be horizontal bolts piercing the beams (*trabes*) at right angles, one on each side of the junction of the beams with the piles, so as to prevent the beams slipping away from the piles. This latter effect is exactly expressed by *quibus disclusis et in contrariam partem revinctis*, 'which (upper and lower) pairs of piles being (thus) kept apart and at the same time bound together, the construction was made tighter by the action of the water'. The action of the stream on the upper face of the upper piles tended to increase their slope and thus approximate the higher portions of the upper piles with the lower piles, which would perhaps not be materially affected by the stream. The inner bolts kept them apart, the outer bolts bound, as it were, the upper and lower pairs of piles together, and this latter action was in the opposite direction (*in contrariam partem*) to the former action. *Utraque* and *utrinque* I take to refer to both pairs, (upper and lower). Hence I require only four bolts for each two pairs. I cannot see how *quibus* can be separated from *disclusis*, which would thus be left without any subject expressed.

The only point on which I feel some doubt is whether *fibula* would be used for a simple bolt—a straight piece of iron or wood passed through the beam. A bar of iron with the two ends bent at right angles to the centre and with one end fixed in the *trabes* at each side of the junction with the piles (*igna*) would better answer the notion of a clasp (*fibula*) but would not be so simple and effective a mode of construction. And had they iron on the spot?

Cross-pieces—thirty to forty feet long—as Napoleon supposes, seem to me utterly alien to the notion of *fibulae*.

Whether a bridge so constructed would require braces between each pair of piles in the direction across the stream, is a question for engineers. The *directa materia*, if properly fastened to the *trabes* and to the banks, would I suppose act as a brace. The depth to which the piles were driven and the nature of the bed of the river would have an important bearing on the matter.—H. J. ROBY.

NOTE ON HOR. *Epod.* xvii, 32,—

nec Sicana feruida

Uirens in Aelna flamma.

Uirens is the reading of the best MSS.; others have

furens or *urens*. Editors generally retain *uirens*, though they do not agree as to the exact meaning of the word, of which they offer the three following interpretations: (1) That it is a synonym for *uigens*, (2) That it refers to the green colour of the sulphurous flames, (3) That it is equivalent to *fulgens*. In support of this rendering they cite Plautus, *Menaechni* 818 (Vahlen),

Uiden tu illi oculos uirere?

Here however Ritschl proposes to substitute *lurere* for *uirere*, and I would ask if a similar change should not be made in the present passage of the *Epodes*. *Lurens* seems precisely the word required to describe the lurid fires of the volcano, and Ovid (*Met.* XIV. 791) actually uses *lurida* as an epithet of *sulfura*.

J. H. ONIONS.

MACROB. Sat. vii. 4 § 7 *nec tertium defuisset exemplum, ita esse vitandam ciborum varietatem ut varia solent vina mutari*. So it runs in Eysenhardt's edition; the context convinced me that the last word should be *vitari*; cf. c. 5 § 15 *et ideo varia vina vitantur*. On turning to Jan's edition I find that MS. P has *mutari*, but Jan with the margin of MS. H reads *vitari*. This is not the only place in which Eysenhardt has forsaken his predecessor for the worse.—J. E. B. M.

APSYRTUS.—In the preface (§ 3) to his *Mulomedicina* Vegetius speaks contemptuously of the style of his predecessor Apsyrtus. From Suidas (s. v. *Ἀψύρτος*) we learn that Apsyrtus wrote in Greek. The Latin version found by Prof. Wilh. Meyer (cod. Monac. 243) at München, confirms the censure of Vegetius. Prof. Meyer promises critical editions of Apsyrtus, Vegetius and Pelagonius (*Archiv für lat. Lexik.* III 588, citing *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad. d. Wiss. Philol.*—philos.—histor. Klasse, 1885, p. 395).—J. E. B. M.

DIFFICULTIES IN JUVENAL.—It is with extreme diffidence that I venture to re-suggest some of the old difficulties connected with Juvenal's Satires, and I do so really in the hope of eliciting a solution of them from English authorities on the subject. The first I will notice is the custom of the *sportula* as represented by Juvenal, which in two or three important particulars is quite unknown to Martial, who beyond a doubt was an eye-witness of what he described. Juvenal for example represents it as distributed in the morning. Professor Friedländer calls this an unimportant difference. I cannot agree with him. Considering the rigid uniformity of Roman society life under the Empire, such a difference in two writers describing Roman manners at about the same period seems to me most puzzling. Suppose two writers describing Cambridge University life should one of them represent the time for boating practice as regularly beginning at 9 A.M., and the other at 2 P.M., it would surely raise doubts as to the accuracy of the information of one of them. I leave out of the question the probabilities of the case, that is, the improbability (1) that a dole, which appears to have been a substitute for a dinner, should be given in the morning; and (2) that a practical people should pay wages at the beginning and not at the end of the day. I confine myself to the difficulty raised by the difference of representation between the two writers. It is clear, I think, from a comparison of Martial X. 70, 5—14, with Juvenal I. 127 fol., that the one regards the distribution of the *sportula* in the evening, the other in the morning as a matter of course; that Martial knew nothing of a morning, Juvenal nothing

of an evening distribution. Now surely such a discrepancy as this cannot be considered unimportant. But there are other discrepancies. Juvenal represents the *sportula* as received by women. Martial knows absolutely nothing of such a custom. There is only one line (quoted by Professor Mayor in his note on Juv. I. 95) which wears even a semblance of supporting such a supposition. But in this line it seems pretty clear on careful consideration of the passage that *sportula* there signifies not the distribution, but the amount of a dole. The former signification would spoil the progress of the epigram. Again, Juvenal represents the *sportula* as received by men of high position and wealth, nobles, consuls, and rich freedmen. Of this there is no hint in Martial. Yet it is alike incredible that, if he knew of such a practice, he should not utilise it in his epigrams, and that he should not know of it, if it existed. For if he laughs at the rich and noble, as he does, for attending the morning *levées* of court favorites and generally of men more influential than themselves, he would surely laugh louder at them for receiving a dole. This fact, one may remark in passing, viz. that great men performed the *salutatio*, might suggest to one not intimately acquainted with the life of the period the inference that they received the *sportula*, which in the case of clients was so intimately connected with the *salutatio*.

Now Professor Friedländer apparently considers that these discrepancies are sufficiently accounted for by the fact that Juvenal belonged to a rather later time than Martial. But this allows an extremely small margin for a remarkable change to take place in the habits of Roman society. If the date of any of the satires may be fixed by allusions contained in them, that of the first satire cannot be later than about A.D. 100, the date of the banishment of Marius (cf. I. 49, VIII. 120).¹ Professor Friedländer says rather vaguely that the changes alluded to probably began first after the death of Domitian. But Martial can hardly have left Rome earlier than A.D. 98, and was in constant communication with the city until he died some few years after. This leaves at most a space of five or six years for these changes to have developed in. But such changes must surely have developed gradually. If therefore the difference between the two poets in their allusions to this subject is due to difference of periods, it seems necessary to assign a date to Juvenal considerably lower than the one usually assumed. And this leads on to the whole question of the date of the author of these satires, and what evidence we have for fixing it. However, I confine myself to one difficulty here, content for the present if I can provoke an authority to solve it.—H. M. STEPHENSON.

MOMMSEN (*Röm. Gesch.* v. p. 145) says that Vespasian disbanded five of the German legions after the Batavian revolt, viz. I. Germ., IV. Maced., XVI. Gall., V. Alaud., and XV. Primig. That he disbanded the first three is almost certain. I. was probably joined with VII. Galbiana, afterwards called Gemina; IV. and XVI. were replaced by IV. Flavia Felix and XVI. Flav. Firma. But there seem to be several reasons against the disbanding of the two last. (1) Vespasian only created three new legions, the two already mentioned, and II. Adjutrix. If therefore he disbanded five, the frontiers would be left with two legions less than before. This, in view of the state of Britain, the East, Germany and the lower Danube, is very improbable. (2) The V. and XV. were the two legions besieged by Civilis in Vetera, and it was not till Vespasian's final abandonment of them and the surrender of I. and XVI. that they at last gave in. Compared with the mutinous conduct

of the other legions, theirs was praiseworthy. (3) We know that one legion was annihilated by the Sarmatae under Domitian, Suct. *Dom.* 6., but with the exception of the five in question no legions are missed up to the middle of the second century (*C. I. L.* vi. 3492) except XXII. Deiot., which was never in the west, XXI. Rapax almost certainly disbanded by Domitian after the rising of Saturninus (Marq^{de} *Staatsv.* ii. p. 450 n. 8) and IX. Hispana in Britain. It seems therefore necessary to infer that out of these two legions, probably V. Alaud. was the one destroyed under Domitian, and replaced by I. Minervia. Grotefend (*Real-Encycl.* IV. p. 896) with much probability assigns the disbanding of XV. Prim. to Trajan.

E. G. HARDY.

ON THE WORD *γλυφίδες*.—The word *γλυφίδας* in *Il.* iv. 122 and *Od.* xxi. 419 is usually explained as the 'notch' of the arrow into which the bow-string fits. It is so explained by Hesychius s.v. in *El. Magn.* and by Eustath. on the two places in Homer, and translated 'notch' merely by all translators. Moreover, in Apoll. Rhod. iii. 282, we find *γλυφίδας μίσση ἐνέκνῃθρο νευρῇ*, where it can have no other meaning. In Homer this meaning makes fairly good sense, but that it has not been thought to be entirely satisfactory is clear from the fact that Hayman, *ad. Od. l.c.* understands it to mean 'the extremities on either side of the arrow nick'; and Merry says, 'it is not impossible that by *γλυφίδας* are meant some slight projections at the nock of the arrow, for the fingers of the right hand to press against in drawing the bow.' Both these interpretations have the merit of making excellent sense and explaining the plural, but the etymology of the word appears to me entirely to preclude their adoption. The word occurs again in Hdt. viii. 128, *τοξέματος παρὰ (or περὶ) τὰς γλυφίδας περιελίσσαντες καὶ περὶώσαντες τὸ βιβλίον ἐτάξον ἐς συγκείμενον χυρίον*. Here the meaning assigned to the word in Homer does not make sense, and Schweighäuser consequently explains it to mean 'the grooves into which the feathers fitted.' He adopts *περὶ* for *παρὰ*, after Valcknär, from Aen. Tact. 31, where the story from Hdt. is quoted, and he translates (after Cassaub.) 'circa sagittae crenas epistolam volventes et alas ei applicantes.' I may add that *crena* seems to be a word of uncertain meaning, and here merely represents *γλυφίδας* without explaining it further than as 'notch' of some sort (see L. and S. sub *χηλή*). Liddell and Scott, in their last edition, adopt Schweigh.'s explanation of *γλυφίδες*, but by a strange blunder translate *περὶ τὸ β.* 'having made it (i.e. the letter) serve as feathers to the arrow,' which is not only a mistake, but an absurdity. Paley, *ad. Il. l.c.* and Eur. *Or.* 274, also adopts this explanation. It does not however suit Homer well, for there is little point in saying 'he drew the grooves for the feathers.' In Abicht's Herodotus I find a third explanation. He keeps *παρὰ*, the MSS. reading, and says in his note, 'near the notches at the butt end of the arrow, which served as a holding place for the fingers while drawing the string.' We should rather expect the dat. after *παρὰ* in this sense, but the explanation is very plausible, and is supported by Suid., who has under *γλυφίδας*,—*τὰς χηλὰς τῆς ἀκίδος ἀλς τὴν νευρὴν προσέγομεν*, and by a second explanation of *El. Magn.* *τὰς παρὰ τοῖς περὶοῖς ἐντομὰς τοῦ βέλους*. It makes very good sense too in Homer, and as to Eur. *Or.* 274, *περὶ τὰς γλυφίδας*, either of the last two meanings, or even the first (though not so well) will suit, because 'feathered notches' is clearly put by synecdoche for 'feathered arrows.' If then *γλυφίδας* is confined to mean some particular notch, I would

suggest this explanation, and consider that Apoll. Rhod. is here an 'ignorant imitator of Homer,' a character often assigned to him by Buttmann, and sometimes unjustly, I think. I am however informed by Mr. Cecil Smith that, as far as one can judge from sculpture and paintings, no arrow—Assyrian, Greek, or Roman—has these notches assumed by Abicht, and that certainly none of the Egyptian reed arrows at the British Museum have it. This is strong negative evidence, therefore I am rather inclined to believe that *γλυφίδες*, which merely means 'a carving,' may have more than one meaning, that e.g. it may mean notch at the end of the arrow in Homer, and grooves for the feathers (or perhaps notches at the side) in Herodotus. This is hinted at by the double explanation in *El. Magn.* and by Schweigh. himself, who says that not the *crena* 'in infima parte sagittae' is meant, but the *crenae* into which the feathers were inserted. I may add that in Apoll. Rhod. iii. 218 the word occurs as a term of architecture.

R. C. SEATON.

NOTE ON *Δίκαιον*.—In a pamphlet by Mr. V. Ball of Dublin (*Animals and Plants of India*. 1885.) treating of the fauna and flora described by Herodotus, Ktesias, and others, mention is made (p. 22) of the *δίκαιον*, which the author with great probability identifies with the scarabaeus sacer: deriving the name from the Arabic *zikairon* = concealer.

Ktesias describes it as a bird, the size of a partridge's egg, which buried its dung in the earth. The Greeks commonly called it *δίκαιον*, an obvious corruption found in Aelian *De Nat. Anim.* iv. 41.

Is this mysterious animal the original of the still more mysterious being *halcōt pidikaos* = the bird *Dikaos* ('avis cognomine Justa' Zoëga) which appears in the fragmentary Sahidic Acts of Andrew and Paul (printed in part by Zoëga *Catal. Codd. Copt. Valt.*)? The Apostles send it into a city from which the Jews have excluded them, and commission it to raise a dead youth. In other respects it seems to be treated as an ordinary bird.—M. R. JAMES.

CAVILLOR.—In discussing this word in Wölfflin's *Archiv* iv. 78f, Funck says that its first sense is 'to jest,' its later meaning 'to quibble.' I venture to think that the second is the older, as it is the more special, sense. The word and its connexions are rare in early Latin: all pre-Ciceronian literature seems to show only four exx, all from Plautus, viz. *Aul.* 639, *Truc.* 685, *Stich.* 226, *Miles* 641. In the first, 'aufer cavillam: non ego nunc nugas ago,' the sense of 'quibble' is by far most appropriate; the second and third passages will admit of either sense; the fourth is bracketed by Ribbeck, though not by most editors. I think that the idea of 'quibbling in jest' suits all four contexts. Festus (= Verrius) explains it exactly thus *c. est iocosa calumniatio*. The derivation is, of course, uncertain, but if the word be connected with *caveo* (as is stated in Pareus' *lexicon* and as Prof. Nettleship has lately conjectured anew), the sense of 'quibble' will come very naturally. The objection to the derivations usually given is that they do not suit the meaning. *Cavillor* always means rather mild witticism: *κατὰξ* (Fick) and *κόβαλος* (de Saussure *Voyelles* p. 106) denote violence, while *calvo* presents phonetic difficulties.—F. HAVERFIELD.

JOHN CLEMENT.—If we are ever to see an adequate history of classical philology in England, many hands must combine to glean from the field of letters every scattered ear. Few would look for an elaborate account of Clement, once page of Sir Thomas More, and afterwards Greek Professor at Oxford, in Teubner's

Bibliotheca. Yet there it stands, in the Preface to the Third Edition (1868) of the *Anacreontica*, by Valentine Rose.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR. [Since the above was in type two writers have spoken of Clement, Mr. Thompson Cowper in the *Dict. of National Biography*, and Prof. Rendel Harris in his book on the Leicester Codex. Neither of them is acquainted with Rose's researches.]

TO POUR OIL ON THE TROUBLED WATERS.—This proverb points to a practice which has, I believe, been lately tried with life-boats in tempestuous weather, and which was not unknown to the ancients, as we read in Pliny, *N.H.* ii. 106 (*Quem fallit omne (mare) oleo tranquillari, et ob id urinantes ore spargere quoniam mitiget naturam asperam lucemque deportet*). So Plutarch (*Nat. Qu.* p. 914 F) makes it a subject of inquiry, *Διὰ τί τῆς θαλάττης ἐλαίῳ καταρραυομένης γίνεται καταφάνεια καὶ γαλήνη*; compare also his treatise, *De Primo Frigido*, p. 960. In both passages he combats Aristotle's explanation of the fact, and gives another which he considers more satisfactory. Bede must have forgotten this in his account of the miraculous preservation of Eanfleda, bride of King Oswy, from the danger of shipwreck (*H.E.* iii. 15.) St. Aidan, giving his blessing to the priest who was sent to escort her from her home in Kent, entrusted to him a flask of holy oil, which he told him would be required to still the storm on their return. So it

turned out: the vessel was on the point of sinking, when the priest bethought him of Aidan's remedy; the oil was poured out, and the sea was immediately smooth. *Sicque factum est*, is Bede's comment, *ut vir Dei et per prophetiae spiritum tempestatem praedixerit futuram, et per virtutem ejusdem spiritus hanc exortam, quamvis corporaliter absens, sopiverit*. Bede is careful to cite his authority, and evidently regards the incident as entirely supernatural, no less so than the miracle of Germanus (*H.E.* i. 17), *qui adsumpto in nomine sanctae Trinitatis levi aquae spargine fluctus saccientes opprimit*.

May we not look upon this as a typical case? One cause of the easy acceptance of miraculous stories in the Middle Ages, was that Roman civilization was itself miraculous to the barbarian mind.

NOTE ON C. R. I p. 192 col. i.—Mr. Margoliouth writes: 'A story very similar to that quoted by you is to be found on p. 154 of the Vulgar Arabic Grammar of Caussin de Perceval ed. 5, with some variation in the numbers and the *mise-en-scène*. Caussin does not state from what book he obtained the Arabic text, but the story is Eastern enough.'

Mr. Stout, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, refers me to Grimm's *Märchen* No. 7 with the notes. The exact story will probably be found in some Italian or French collection of tales.—J. E. B. M.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(Letter from a French University Professor.)

II.

Il existe dans les lycées des examens de passage d'une classe à l'autre. Ces examens deviennent plus sérieux d'année en année, et d'après les circulaires ministérielles doivent continuer à le devenir de plus en plus; ce qui prouve qu'ils ne le sont pas encore au plus haut degré. Il y a pourtant chaque année un certain nombre d'élèves refusés à l'entrée de différentes classes; il y en a même qu'on fait redescendre dans le courant du premier trimestre. Un examen plus important que les autres a lieu au sortir de la 4^e. C'est ce qu'on appelle l'examen de grammaire. Il faut l'avoir subi avec succès pour entrer dans la division supérieure du lycée et aussi dans certaines écoles. Entre la classe de Rhétorique et celle de Philosophie, le lycée ne fait pas subir d'examen à ses élèves. Ils vont se présenter devant la Faculté des lettres, et alors commencent les examens vraiment importants et qu'on n'affronte pas sans émotion. Essayons de les caractériser rapidement.

Le premier est un examen qui se passe en deux fois, à un an d'intervalle. Au sortir de la Rhétorique, on subit une première série d'épreuves, après la Philosophie, une autre série. Le candidat qui a subi avec succès les unes et les autres obtient le titre de bachelier ès lettres. Ce titre est la condition de l'admission dans les Facultés, dans certaines écoles du gouvernement, et enfin dans une multitude de carrières diverses, sans parler du volontariat dans l'armée, pour lequel le baccalauréat dispense de l'examen spécial. Aussi se fait-il chaque année des milliers de bacheliers dans toute la France. Il y a des Facultés qui voient en une année se présenter devant elles plus

de mille candidats pour la première partie, un peu moins pour la seconde. Deux tiers environ des candidats sont ajournés à la première partie, la moitié à la seconde. La plupart reviennent à la charge jusqu'à ce qu'ils réussissent. La première partie de l'examen du baccalauréat consiste en trois épreuves écrites et plusieurs orales; composition française, version latine, et thème allemand ou anglais; interrogations sur le latin, le grec, le français, l'allemand ou l'anglais, l'histoire et la géographie, l'histoire littéraire. Le sujet de la composition française est tantôt historique, tantôt littéraire. La version latine est tirée de Cicéron, de Quintilien, quelquefois de Tacite ou de Lucrèce, etc., mais autant que possible d'un des ouvrages qu'on ne lit pas communément dans les classes. On n'est admis à se présenter aux épreuves orales que si les trois compositions sont passables. La plupart des échecs sont attribuables aux épreuves écrites. Les épreuves orales de latin et de grec portent sur les auteurs qu'on étudie dans la division supérieure du lycée. Chaque candidat indique six ouvrages de chaque langue, parmi lesquels l'examinateur choisit. Comme on est pressé, à cause du grand nombre des candidats, ces interrogations se bornent le plus souvent à faire traduire quelques lignes; tout au plus y ajoutera-t-on deux ou trois questions sur des temps de verbes en grec, sur un détail de grammaire ou d'antiquités en latin. Les bons élèves des lycées s'en tirent fort bien en général, quelques-uns d'une manière brillante; mais la différence entre les dix premiers d'une classe et les dix derniers est très forte. Cela vient de ce que les élèves faibles n'ont pas été éliminés avec assez de fermeté des classes où leur insuffisance a commencé

à se faire sentir. Il faut avouer enfin que les meilleurs même baissent d'année en année. A la seconde partie du baccalauréat les études classiques ne sont pas plus représentées que dans l'enseignement de la classe de Philosophie. Les candidats peuvent être interrogés sur certains livres désignés à l'avance, de Platon, Aristote, Cicéron, &c., dans la langue originale. Mais les examinateurs insistent peu sur ce point. Aussi le bachelier ès lettres sait-il beaucoup moins de grec et de latin que l'élève de Rhétorique. Il a passé une année à oublier ces langues.

Le baccalauréat est le premier grade universitaire, la licence ès lettres le second, le doctorat le troisième. Ce dernier est exigé de ceux qui se destinent à l'enseignement supérieur. Entre la licence et le doctorat se place ordinairement l'agrégation des lettres ou de grammaire, qui donne droit à être professeur dans un lycée. Le titre de licencié suffit pour être nommé professeur dans les collèges, ou chargé de cours dans les lycées. Quelques-uns le recherchent aussi comme titre honorifique. Il y a quatre ordres de licence ès lettres : la licence philosophique, historique, licence des langues vivantes, et enfin la licence ès lettres proprement dite. C'est cette dernière qui doit surtout vous intéresser. Les autres n'en diffèrent d'ailleurs que par certaines épreuves spéciales destinées à établir la capacité du candidat à enseigner la philosophie, l'histoire ou les langues vivantes.

Les épreuves écrites de la licence sont : une composition française et une latine, un thème grec, une composition de grammaire et de métrique ; enfin quelques épreuves facultatives et ne pouvant exercer qu'une faible influence, mais toujours favorable, sur le résultat. Elles ont pour sujet des matières non comprises dans le programme ordinaire, comme par exemple, les langues romanes, et particulièrement les vers latins, dont c'est ici le dernier refuge. Une des gloires de l'Université, il y a trente ans encore, les vers latins sont tombés si bas, que c'est à peine si 12 ou 15 % des candidats usent du droit qu'ils ont d'en présenter. La composition latine a généralement pour sujet une question de critique littéraire : l'intervention des dieux dans l'Énéide, le jugement d'Horace sur les anciens poètes, l'art dramatique dans tel dialogue de Platon, ou quelque autre banalité de ce genre, qui puisse se traiter en 6 heures à huis clos. Les examinateurs se voient de plus en plus forcés de juger principalement d'après le style, ce qui n'a pas grand inconvénient, puisque la composition française est là pour montrer si le candidat a des idées, s'il sait les disposer et les exposer. Dans la composition latine, il s'agit surtout de s'assurer qu'il manie le latin sans trop de peine, qu'il en a assez l'habitude pour ne pas laisser échapper des incorrections trop graves, en un mot, qu'il sera capable de diriger les exercices latins de sa classe. Le thème grec est l'épreuve la plus redoutée. On ne peut pas être extrêmement exigeant envers des candidats qui n'ont guère commencé à traduire en grec qu'après avoir achevé leurs études secondaires ; mais on cherche à relever le niveau en se montrant sévère pour les incorrections et en demandant même que le grec de ces thèmes ne soit pas trop français. La grammaire et la métrique forment ensemble une seule épreuve. Les sujets sont forcément très élémentaires, parce que le candidats, travaillant à huis clos, doivent tout tirer de leurs souvenirs et de leurs réflexions du moment. C'est ou bien une question de morphologie à élucider, ou bien un chapitre de syntaxe à exposer, ou encore quelques lignes de texte à commenter ; et pour la métrique, soit des vers à scander, soit la structure de telle ou telle sorte de vers à indiquer. Le programme d'ailleurs ne va pas au-delà des mètres d'Horace. Des tragiques grecs, de Pindare, pas question.

Les candidats dont les compositions ont été jugées passables sont admis à l'examen oral, qui consiste principalement dans l'explication de fragments d'auteurs grecs, latins et français, pris dans un certain nombre d'ouvrages désignés à l'avance par le ministre. En outre, il leur est adressé une série de questions sur l'histoire des trois littératures dites classiques, sur les institutions grecques et romaines ; enfin ils ont à justifier d'une connaissance suffisante de l'allemand ou de l'anglais pour se servir de livres écrits en une de ces langues. En somme, c'est un examen d'études secondaires. On peut le subir avec éclat sans s'être jamais essayé à aucune recherche personnelle, sans s'être servi d'ouvrages de première main sur aucun sujet, sans savoir même ce que c'est que la science de l'antiquité. Il suffit, avec un esprit ouvert et quelques dispositions, d'avoir subi un certain entraînement pour la composition, d'avoir fait des lectures accessibles à toute personne un peu cultivée, et d'avoir préparé avec soin les auteurs du programme. Cependant il faut croire que nous sommes menacés d'un excès d'érudition chez nos jeunes professeurs, puisque des circulaires ministérielles recommandent avec insistance de ne rien demander aux candidats qui sorte du cercle des connaissances générales.

Une fois licencié ès lettres, on peut se présenter à l'agrégation. Encore ici il y a plusieurs catégories. Celles qui vous intéressent sont l'agrégation de grammaire et l'agrégation des lettres. L'agrégation n'est pas un grade que les Facultés confèrent ; celles-ci n'ont pas à s'en occuper ; elle est au concours. Chaque année le ministre fixe d'avance le nombre de candidats à recevoir, une vingtaine ou une trentaine, par exemple ; un jury nommé par le ministre classe les candidats, plus de 150 quelquefois, et les premiers en rang sont reçus jusqu'à concurrence du nombre fixé. Ce système a l'avantage de stimuler beaucoup les candidats, puisque le niveau qu'il faut atteindre n'est pas connu d'avance, et qu'on peut toujours espérer, à force de travail, de surpasser ses concurrents. Mais il a de grands inconvénients aussi. Il implique l'unité de jury, l'unité de session, l'unité de programme pour chaque ordre d'agrégation, et par conséquent une uniformité dans les études préparatoires qui n'est certes pas faite pour développer l'esprit d'investigation et pour faire naître les vocations scientifiques. Pour comparer équitablement entre eux 150 jeunes gens, on ne peut examiner chacun sur ce qui l'intéresse et ce qu'il a étudié par goût. Où serait l'unité de mesure ? Combien trouverait-on d'examineurs capables de passer, pendant 15 ou 20 jours de suite, d'un sujet à l'autre, avec des candidats spécialement préparés sur chacun ? Il est inévitable aussi qu'un seul jury en présence de tant de candidats ne soit pas un peu pressé par le temps. Certains candidats des mieux notés rapportent l'impression d'un défilé bien rapide. J'en connais un, reçu second du premier coup, qui a coutume d'appeler l'agrégation un baccalauréat supérieur. Et il est bien vrai, que, à l'agrégation comme à la licence, les épreuves les plus importantes sont des exercices d'écoliers, thèmes, versions, compositions à huis clos, rien qui permette de juger de ce que sera le travail de l'homme fait, du professeur. La leçon et l'explication préparée sont les seules épreuves utiles à cet égard. Mais c'en sont deux sur neuf ou dix, et l'on n'y est admis qu'après avoir réussi aux autres. Il est vrai que l'agrégation est destinée à recruter le personnel de l'enseignement secondaire, et non celui des Facultés. Mais ce ne sera jamais qu'un enseignement médiocre que celui dont les représentants n'auront pas tout au moins goûté du fruit de l'arbre de la science. Les épreuves écrites de l'agrégation sont à peu près les

mêmes que pour la licence, si ce n'est qu'il s'y ajoute une version latine et une version de langue vivante, et qu'à l'agrégation de grammaire la dissertation latine est remplacée par un thème latin. La partie orale comprend une explication de texte dans chacune des trois langues classiques ; une seconde explication, plus approfondie, après 24 heures de préparation, d'un texte grec ou latin : enfin une leçon sur un sujet littéraire ou historique. On peut se présenter au concours d'agrégation indéfiniment, et il est rare d'être reçu la première fois. Il n'y a que peu de différence entre les programmes de l'agrégation des lettres et de l'agrégation de grammaire. Les deux jurys et leur manière d'apprécier se ressemblent beaucoup moins.

Le doctorat ès-lettres est conféré par les Facultés des lettres, en principe. En réalité, c'est la Faculté de Paris seule qui confère le véritable doctorat, celui qui ouvre les portes de l'enseignement supérieur. On ne se présente devant les Facultés de province que pour l'honneur. Pour obtenir le doctorat, on n'a pas d'examen à subir. On écrit deux thèses, une française, qui est souvent un gros livre, et une latine, moins

volumineuse. Ces thèses sont lues par un membre de la Faculté, puis imprimées, si elles sont acceptées ; enfin, on est appelé à les soutenir, en séance publique, devant un jury dont les membres, au nombre de six au moins, les critiquent successivement.

Ainsi se clôt la série des épreuves que trouvent échelonnées sur leur route ceux qui se destinent en France à l'enseignement classique, soit secondaire, soit supérieur. Vous vous étiez demandé peut-être pourquoi je plaçais ma lettre sur les examens entre les deux qui parlent d'enseignement. Vous voyez maintenant que je me souvenais de votre question : *how far the instruction given at college is distinct from that given at school*. On ne peut guère déterminer la différence qui existe entre l'enseignement secondaire et l'enseignement supérieur, sans comparer le baccalauréat à la licence et à l'agrégation. L'examen placé à la fin d'une période d'études finit toujours, dans une certaine mesure, par en fixer le caractère. Connaissant les examens entre lesquels les études classiques d'ordre supérieur se trouvent encadrées, vous devinez déjà jusqu'à un certain point ce qu'elles doivent être.

(To be continued.)

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

TRINITY MONDAY, 1887.

This is Election Day for Fellows and Scholars. Our new Fellow is Mr. John Isaac Beare, First Scholar in Classics, 1878, First Senior Moderator in Classics, Fourth Senior Moderator in Logics and Ethics, and University Student, 1879. Seven Classical Scholars of the House were elected.

I promised in my May letter to give some account of the other Classical Schools in Ireland and of the Trinity College men who are connected with them. The Queen's Colleges at Belfast, Cork and Galway were founded in 1849, and incorporated in 1851 into the Queen's University. In 1882 the Queen's University was dissolved in order to make room for the Royal University. The difference between the two institutions is that the Queen's University consisted of the three Queen's Colleges only, and none but students matriculated at a Queen's College could become graduates of Queen's University ; but the Royal University is open to all comers, whether they have or have not matriculated at a Queen's College or at any College. The Queen's Colleges continue to subsist, until some new political move shall bring them down like the University called after them ; but the political aspect of matters cannot be treated in these pages, though it is an unfortunate fact that political and sectarian considerations keep cropping up in the most unexpected places in Irish educational history. To return to our own proper subject ; the professorial staff of the Queen's Colleges has been all along recruited, almost without exception, from Trinity College, Dublin. At present the Professor of Greek at Belfast, Mr. Hastings Crossley, the Professor of Greek at Cork, Mr. William Ridgeway, and the Professor of Latin at Galway, Mr. John Fletcher Davies, are all Trinity College men. Mr. Crossley entered in 1864 and became a Scholar of the House in 1865. He was First Senior Moderator in Classics,

and Second Senior Moderator in Logics and Ethics in 1868. He was a candidate for Fellowship in 1870 and 1871, and obtained a prize each time, but ultimately retired from the contest and accepted the Belfast Professorship, to which he was appointed in 1878. Mr. Crossley has published "Saul," a Vice-Chancellor's prize poem ; also an edition of Book I. of the works of Marcus Aurelius. He is completing this edition, we understand, in collaboration with Mr. Lindsay, of Jesus College, Oxford. Mr. Crossley contributed largely to *Dublin Translations*.

Mr. William Ridgeway became a Scholar of the House in 1873 (having for contemporaries Mr. Louis Claude Purser, now Fellow, and Mr. Oscar Wilde). In 1875 he was second Senior Moderator in Classics and first Senior Moderator in Modern Literature. Subsequently he went to Cambridge and became a Fellow of Caius. He was appointed to the Greek Chair at Cork in succession to Mr. Vaughan Boulger (another Trinity College man) in 1884. Mr. Ridgeway's published work has chiefly consisted of contributions to learned journals.

Mr. John Fletcher Davies was a Scholar of the House as long ago as 1858, and was a Senior Moderator in Classics in 1859. After taking his degree he became head Classical master of Kingstown School, which although a private and unendowed institution has perhaps sent out as many brilliant men as any other school in Ireland, especially during Mr. Davies' time. He retired in 1878, and for two years lived principally in England. In 1880, when Dr. Maguire gave up the Chair of Latin in Galway on becoming a Fellow, it was offered to Mr. Davies and accepted by him. Mr. Davies' chief works are his editions of *Choephoree*, *Agamemnon*, and *Eumenides*. Scholars have differed as to the value of these editions, but whatever may be the opinion formed as to the audacity of the commentator, nobody will deny him the praise of a

brilliance amounting to genius. It is next to impossible to read Mr. Davies' work, and wholly impossible to hold converse with him, without feeling the presence of a quite unique mind. Whatever one may think of his views on particular points, one is compelled to feel that the enthusiasm of scholarship is in the man, to a degree hardly ever paralleled. This is the secret of his influence with his pupils, an influence in which he may be said to be unrivalled among teachers, in Ireland at any rate.

The Professors of Latin at Belfast and Cork, and of Greek at Galway, are Oxford or Cambridge men.

There are no Colleges, strictly speaking, affiliated to the Royal University, unless the Queen's Colleges may be said to be so. The relation of the Royal

University to the various independent schools and colleges of Ireland is rather anomalous. The endowed schools and colleges of royal foundation throughout Ireland send their pupils to Trinity College rather than to the Royal University; and so do the Erasmus Smith schools, and others endowed in time past by private founders. The Royal University, therefore, is chiefly recruited from the various Roman Catholic seminaries throughout the island, and it is impracticable to say anything of their staff or their system, except that the staff is not recruited from Trinity College, Dublin.

Not to trespass too much on your space, I reserve for a future letter some account of our curriculum and methods of study.

(For Examinations see page 3 of Wrapper.)

ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRITISH MUSEUM CATALOGUE OF GREEK COINS.
The Peloponnesus. Edited by PERCY GARDNER,
D. Litt. Lond. 1887.

THIS summer the *British Museum Coin Catalogue* has advanced one stage farther on the way to completion. Its new volume is, we are sorry to say, the last of the series which will be edited by Professor Gardner, who has just relinquished his post at the Museum in order to go into residence at Oxford as Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology. Geographically speaking we are now brought down to the end of the issues of European Greece, if we except the long-promised volume on Athens and Corinth, which still shows no signs of appearing.

From the numismatist's point of view the Peloponnesus abounds in problems. First and foremost of them is the extraordinary dearth of sixth-century coins in the whole district. With the exception of Corinth, Heraea, and possibly Sicyon, none of its towns seem to have issued money before B.C. 500. Nothing can be stranger than that cities of the first rank like Argos, and great and wealthy religious centres like Elis, should have had no currency at a time when every small town in Asia Minor was accustomed to strike its own coins, and when in Northern Greece comparatively poor states, such as Phocis, had commenced their issues. It is not impossible that archaic coins of additional Peloponnesian towns may some day be discovered, but at present the attributions made to Pheneus, Philius, and other places of early coins with rude incuse reverses are inadmissible: the British Museum wisely classes the coins in question as 'European, Uncertain,' and their fabric seems to point to Thracian and Macedonian rather than Peloponnesian localities. The only explanation of the dearth of issues in Southern Greece is the predominance of the Aeginetan stater, which, as we know from the evidence of inscriptions, was received as the ordinary circulating medium as late as the times of the Peloponnesian war. Taking this hint, we may ascribe the commencement of the issues of Argos, Mantinea, Troezen, Elis, and other cities whose coinage dates from the early years of the fifth century, to the cutting short of the commercial supremacy of Aegina by her first wars with Athens. But even then it remains a problem why the not very important town of Heraea

should have begun to strike money some fifty years before her richer and more powerful neighbours.

The next point of note in the coinage of the Peloponnesus is the appearance of a long series of half-drachms and obols bearing the inscription $\text{APKA}\Delta\text{IKON}$, which from the evidence of style must be ascribed to the period between the Persian wars and the battle of Mantinea (B.C. 480-417). These pieces should by rights imply the existence of an Arcadian league, and their main type, the figure of Zeus, is the one which we should expect to be chosen for a national coinage. But, on the other hand, we have no historical evidence in favour of any confederation, and the Spartan hegemony in the Peloponnesus was always used to prevent the formation of alliances between the smaller states. It is true that in spite of this the Arcadians strove to combine; in *Herod.* ix. 35, for example, we read of an occasion on which every state in the country save Mantinea joined in an attempt to throw off the Spartan yoke. But such alliances were too ephemeral to produce a coinage which on the lowest estimate must have covered forty years, and may well have extended to sixty. Moreover, there are numerous coins of Arcadian towns which are contemporary with these federal issues; Tegea, Cleitor, Psophis, Mantinea, and possibly several other places having struck money between 480 and 417 B.C. The existence therefore of the $\text{APKA}\Delta\text{IKON}$ series places us in a dilemma: either some one town issued pieces which purported to be national and not local, or else—contrary to all historic evidence and probability—some sort of Arcadian league must have lasted on during the greater part of the fifth century. Professor Gardner inclines to the former alternative, and pitches on Heraea as the place of issue, induced by the fact that it was the only Arcadian town which was already possessed of a mint, and by the style of the seated Zeus on the coins, which is not unlike that of some early pieces of Heraea's great neighbour, Elis. That a single town should claim to strike money in behalf of a whole nation is not quite unprecedented: at any rate Tanagra struck coins in the name of the Boeotians in the period 480-470, indicating her individuality only by a T modestly concealed in an obscure part of the coin. Nevertheless, we cannot bring ourselves to accept the conclusion at which Professor Gardner and Dr. Imhoof Blumer have

arrived. Heraea had never any pretensions to a precedence among Arcadian towns; Trapezus was the old site of the kings when the country was still united, while in historical times Mantinea and Tegea were the most important places. Arcadia was usually divided between a philo-Laconian and an anti-Laconian party, but in neither of the factions was Heraea the leading town. Neither was it in any way the religious centre of the nation, for that was undoubtedly to be found in the sanctuary of Zeus Lycaeus in the territory of Lyceosura. Moreover the idea that the *APKAAIKON* coins are a mere continuation of the earlier Heraean series is not entirely borne out by the evidence of style. In fabric as well as in artistic treatment there is a very considerable gap between the last coins of the town and the first of the federal series, while, on the other hand, it would not be impossible to contend that the first of the new series of Heraean issues which Professor Gardner ascribes to the period B.C. 417-370 overlap the last of the Federal coins, the work of which is quite compatible with the concluding years of the fifth century, while their incuse square on the reverse is barely visible. On the whole then we should be inclined to believe, with Mr. Head and Professor Curtius, in the existence of an Arcadian league which persisted throughout the fifth century, although many important towns may have stood aloof from it at various epochs. And if a locality must be found for its mint, the great national sanctuary on Mount Lycaean certainly appears the most natural site.

Turning on to other questions, we are glad to see that Professor Gardner has a word to say in favour of the famous Spartan iron money, whose existence has been so firmly denied. Certainly if, as he says, iron money of Tegea and Argos has been lately discovered, there is not the least reason to doubt the concurrent testimony of tradition as to the persistence of an iron currency at conservative Sparta down to the fourth century. The large Lacedaemonian silver coin with the head of a king, which used to be ascribed to Antigonus Doson's occupation of Sparta after his victory at Sellasia, is moved forward half a century and given to King Areus, of whom the Berlin Museum possesses another tetradrachm, of Alexandrine type, with the unmistakable inscription, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΡΕΟΥΣ*. This identification is certainly very superior to that of M. Boinois, who started the notion that the head was that of Antigonus.

There are one or two attributions in this volume which we should regard as not quite so likely as the last-mentioned one. The Obols ascribed to Parocria should almost certainly be given to the Parrhasians; the Achaean league coins with a trident and the monogram KA are in all probability merely a variety of the coinage of Troezen, not the issues of the town of Ceryneia. It is difficult to see how Dr. Weil, who first started this theory, came to entertain the view. The two small 'uncertain' coins at the end of the volume probably belong to Troezen; the Paris collection owns a drachm whose main type is an archaic female head, full face, exactly similar to these pieces.

This book contains the usual lavish allowance of beautiful autotype plates which the Museum publications display, and is in all respects equal to the rest of this magnificent series of volumes.

C. W. C. OMAN.

Rhodes in Modern Times, by CECIL TORR (Cambridge University Press, 1887), is a continuation of the history of that island, the classical portion of which was contained in the author's previous work, *Rhodes in Ancient Times*. The mediaeval history down to the Ottoman

conquest in 1522 is here given continuously for the first time, and with a view to it the original sources have been conscientiously examined. The task was not a light one, because of the length of the period embraced in the survey, and the obscurity of many of the facts brought to light, which required to be carefully criticised. Only a few of the events included in it come within the scope of this Review. In an enumeration of the earthquakes by which Rhodes has been visited, we learn that the city, after having been destroyed owing to this cause in 227 B.C., and again in 157 A.D., was ruined for the third time in 515 A.D., in the reign of Anastasius I. That emperor made a large grant towards the rebuilding, but neither he nor the Rhodians themselves were in a position to rebuild the place on its former scale; so that it seems to have been at that time that the ancient line of the city walls, which enclosed over a thousand acres, was exchanged for the modern line, which encloses less than a hundred and fifty. Mr. Torr has examined with much acuteness the various stories which grew up around the Colossus of Rhodes. Some of these—for instance, that after it had fallen it was set up again by Vespasian; that in Hadrian's time it was moved; that it was gilt, and 120 feet in height,—arose from its being confused with the colossal statue of Nero at Rome. Other mistakes were caused by the word *στήλη* being applied to it in some accounts in its later meaning 'a statue', and this being confused with the earlier meaning 'a column'. Hence one writer about 300 A.D. describes the Colossus as a marble column a hundred cubits in height, another about 1000 A.D. states that it was a column of bronze a thousand cubits in height; and the stone obelisk in the Meidan at Constantinople was compared in an inscription of the eleventh century upon its base to the Colossus of Rhodes. Again, in allusion to the Colossus, the Rhodians were known among the Byzantine Greeks as *Κολοσσαῖς*, and afterwards the official style of the Latin archbishops of Rhodes was *Archiepiscopus Colossensis*. Hence Sir John Maundeville remarks, that St. Paul wrote an epistle to the inhabitants of that island, *ad Colossenses*. Another curious fact which we learn from this volume relates to the ceramic art in antiquity. It is well known with regard to the plates of the Rhodian ware of the time of the occupation of the island by the Knights of St. John, which are so highly prized by collectors, that they were intended, not for use, but for suspension against walls as ornaments; and even at the present day, when the peasants throughout the island, in whose cottages these treasures were found, have parted with them, their places have been taken by common modern plates, which are hung in the same manner—sometimes to the number of seventy in one room. With a view to this decorative use, the mediaeval plates of this ware were always pierced with two holes for suspension. Now Mr. Torr informs us, that the earliest dishes from Camiros, dating from about 700 B.C., are pierced in just the same way.

H. F. T.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities.

A kriophoros; and a seated ram: both in terracotta, from Beyrût.

A terra-cotta statuette of Eros leaning on a term: from Babylonia.

Mr. W. R. Paton has presented the Carpathos vases noted in Loeschke and Fürtwaengler *Myk. Vas.* p. 83: the Assarlik antiquities mentioned *ante* p. 81, and *Hellenic Journal* viii. 64—82: and three more vases of the 'Mycenaean' type, found near Pothia in

Kalymna, lower down the hill than those found last year.

A jet panel, with relief of a figure standing with uplifted arms in a ship manned by three rowers (Odysseus mocking the Cyclops?)

Two terra-cotta masks, from Tartus: and a leaden Eros in low relief, from Beyrût.

A green jasper intaglio, with Indo-Greek designs.

A gold chain terminating at one end in a lion's head with the Herculean knot: at the other, in a lion's head, with a ring: from Cyprus.

A bronze Etruscan figure of a running female on a flower, probably one of the supports of a cista; she wears the tutulus, and raises her mantle with the left hand: from Todi.

A fine series of twenty-six moulds for terra-cotta figures: from Tarentum.

A lekythos with Maenad (?) rushing to right, looking back and holding out a chelys in her left hand: the flesh is coloured white, the hair buff, the chelys buff with white outline, the drapery left with incised outline on the black glaze: from Tarentum: cf. Sammlung Sabouroff, pl. liv., 1.

Large hydria with friezes of warriors, horsemen, &c., in so-called Chalcidian style: from Cervetri.

Small oblong plaque of bronze with portions of two panels ranged vertically one above the other; within each panel is incised a pair of nude figures, possibly athletes; the style is somewhat rough, apparently a late imitation of an archaic design similar to those in *Ausgrabungen zu Olympia*, vol. iv. pp. 18-19: found in the Tiber, 1887.

Small portrait-head of an old man, in marble.

Cecil Smith.

THE SCARABÆUS FROM IALYSOS.—The fact that a scarabæus with a cartouch of Amenhotep III (about 1500 B.C.) was found at Ialysos in Rhodes in a tomb-chamber containing antiquities of the Mycenaean period has been adduced as proof of the early date of these antiquities. This fact is obviously no proof of their early date, for an object like a scarabæus might be treasured for centuries before interment; but it is, on the other hand, a striking proof of their comparatively late date. The majority of extant scarabæi with cartouches of kings of the Old or the Middle or the New Empire belong to the 'Early Egyptian Revival,' which began with the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty (from 666 B.C. onwards), and these can always be readily distinguished from the contemporary scarabæi of those early kings by certain broad differences of style and of workmanship. There cannot be the slightest doubt that this scarabæus from Ialysos—which is now in Table Case B in the First Vase room in the British Museum—belongs to the Revival. The fact that it was found in that tomb-chamber at Ialysos is therefore a proof, not that the antiquities found with it are little (if at all) later than the Fifteenth Century, but that they are little (if at all) earlier than the Seventh. I have pointed this out before, but venture to point it out again, as the old argument is restated in some recent publications on Homer.—Cecil Torr.

IN the 'Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1887, p. 50, Koumanoudes publishes a woodcut of a disk of Pentelic marble, diam. 1·22 mètre, which he thus describes: 'Ἐφ' ὅσον σώζεται, εἶναι τὸ τρίτον περίπου μέρος δίσκου (ἢ τυπαρίου τυροῦ μεγάλου) . . . ἔχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς ἑτέρας τῶν ὁριζοντίων τοῦ ἐπιφανείων ἀνάγλυπτον κόσμον ἀστεροειδῆ, σχηματιζόμενον ἐκ φύλλων δάφνης, μετὰ δ' αὐτῶν τρύματα κυκλωτερῆ, περί δὲ τῆν ἀντιγὰ γράμματα ἐγκεχαράγμένα κ.τ.λ.

The learned professor hesitates about his explanation, but is inclined to think the 'disk' formed part of a well or fountain, and that the inscription indicated the number of stadia from which the water was drawn.

I think he has rather missed the point. If we imagine the monument restored to its original condition (for which the existing portion gives sufficient data), we obtain an unmistakable *wheel*, such as is the most usual shape employed, e.g. on vase pictures of the fourth century. It consists of a thick felly with four spokes in the form of elongated myrtle leaves: to strengthen these spokes the angles between them and the felly are filled in, so that the spoke is only left free close around the nave: the general view being that of a four-leaved shamrock, the leaves of which represent the empty portions; a form both decorative and obviously most suitable for execution in stone or marble where the spokes would require to be as strong as possible.

The inscription, which as usual upon dedicated wheels¹ runs around the felly, is as follows

... ΣΣΤΑΔΙΩΝΒ...

Considering that it was found in the Olympieion I think we are justified in restoring ἔπος σταδίων τὸ β. If so, the wheel was probably one (the second) of a series of marks set up to delimitate the course of the stadia in the games: this restoration would just cover that portion of the wheel where it would be easily readable in a vertical position.

The remaining slabs of marble found together with this may have formed part of the plinth on which it rested. I am not aware that we have any record of the use of a wheel in this connection: but the single wheel was familiar enough in Greek art, especially in the typical agonistic myth of Pelops and Oinomaos, and I see no reason why this should not have been employed as a distinction from the ordinary goal-post.—Cecil Smith.

Les Musées d'Athènes. Parts 1 and 2. Athens: Karl Wilberg. Fr. 7.50, per part.

Each part of this publication is to contain eight phototype plates by Rhomaides Brothers, nine inches by six without the margin, and short explanatory text in Greek, German, French and English. In the first part the text is by Cavvafias; and by Sophoulis in the second. The plates might be better artistically: but they are good enough for almost all purposes, and they certainly are very cheap. The first shows the portion of the excavations on the Acropolis, to the left of the path from the Propylæa to the Erechtheion, where the archaic marble statues were found in February 1886. Ten plates are devoted to these marble statues. Another represents the Hermes Moscophoros in the Acropolis Museum, for comparison with these. Two others represent two marble heads of somewhat later date, found on the Acropolis in 1882; and the remaining two a bronze head found there in 1882 and another found there in 1886: these last in two aspects each. Altogether, the publication is meritorious and deserving of support.—C. T.

Antike Denkmäler, herausgegeben vom Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Institut. Band 1: erstes Heft. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer. 40 Mk.

This publication replaces the *Monumenti Inediti* so long published in Rome; the *Annali* being at the

¹ See Newton, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions*, No. 138; and Carapanos, *Dodone*, pl. xxvi. 1. p. 47.

same time merged, together with the *Archäologische Zeitung*, in the new *Jahrbuch*. It is intended to appear yearly and to consist as a rule of twelve folio plates, with short explanatory text, in a portfolio. In the part before us the explanatory text is far too short. For example, the first two plates (exhibiting the newly-found Peisistratid temple of Athene on the Acropolis) depend on an article of 14 pages by Dörpfeld in the corresponding number of the *Athenische Mittheilungen*. The substance of this article should have been given with the plates: or at any rate, something more than a little note of thirty lines. These two plates are very satisfactory, including a detailed plan of the foundations in their present condition, a restoration of the front and some architectural members, and also a plan showing the position of this temple and of the Erechtheion and of the Parthenon of Cimon and the Parthenon of Pericles. Two other plates illustrate the later Parthenon by the reproduction of the drawings of the east and west fronts made before the explosion by Carrey and by the unknown artist employed by Nointel. Laborde's rendering of Carrey's drawings is slightly better than this; but his book is scarce, and he does not give the drawings made for Nointel; and the rendering of both sets by Michaelis is far inferior to that before us. Another plate represents in profile and in full face a marble head belonging to a copy of the Athene Parthenos, found in Rome and now in Berlin. It seems minutely accurate; and gives the goddess a far more youthful and mobile face than the other copies yet known. The plate is excellent; the surface of the marble and the remains of colour upon it being rendered in very delicate tints. Equally excellent in their way are the two plates of two of the bronze statues found in Rome the winter before last, the seated boxer and the standing portrait statue of a young man—the latter in two aspects, from left and right. The play of light and shade on the bronze is admirably rendered. But the coloured plate of a Roman fresco of trees and birds is less successful, looking somewhat stiff and heavy and suggesting excessive restoration. All these plates are well suited to such a publication: but it is not easy to see why two plates should be given up to two vases with the signature of Sosias. Both of them have been published before, one of them in the *Monumenti* themselves; and if any further publication were necessary, it had better have been reserved for the *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*. Nor is it easy to see why two more of these large plates should be given up to fifty-four little votive tablets, which had better have been published two or three to the page in an ordinary volume. Not that they are uninteresting in themselves: they illustrate a style of painting otherwise known only from the black-figured vases: and their publication in any form is a matter for congratulation in this country inasmuch as, although such tablets were bought by the hundred for the Berlin Museum and the Louvre after their discovery at Corinth in 1879, not a single specimen was obtained for the British Museum. The same objection may be taken to the remaining plate, which contains twenty-nine pieces of jewelry nearly all found in Ithaca: though these certainly form a graceful group and are skilfully etched. But although a praiseworthy desire to make this publication representative of the various branches of classical archaeology has brought about the inclusion of several unsuitable subjects, this does not seriously diminish its merit as a whole. And it would be well if it were better known in this country: for a perception of the excellence of these illustrations of pieces of sculpture in various aspects and in colour

might do something towards the suppression of the prevalent mania for plaster casts, which are in truth costly and cumbersome and destructive of all sense for beauty.—C. T.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. 1887: part 2. Berlin.

1. Mayer on a marble group in the Villa Borghese of an Amazon riding down two warriors, probably inspired by the Pergamene Amazonomachia on the Acropolis: plate. 2. Dümmler on the early silver girdle with reliefs, found at Poli-tis-Chrysokou in Cyprus and now in the British Museum: plate. 3. Hauser shows that the bronze statuette at Tübingen, published in the last volume by Schwabe as a charioteer, really represents a runner in the Hoplitodromos. 4. Löwy on two reliefs in the Villa Albani. 5. Heydemann on vase-paintings representing Seilenos before Midas. 6. Wernicke on some representations of the Triton of Tanagra. 7. Köpp on the origin of high-relief among the Greeks. 8. Heydemann argues from a vase in the Museum at Naples that the statue there commonly called Aphrodite Kallipygos really represents an Hetera. 9. Schmidt on a relief in the Villa Albani.—C. T.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1887: parts 1 and 2. Athens.

1. Dümmler and Studniczka argue, in opposition to Furtwängler and Löschke, that the antiquities from Mycenæ are Carian in origin, and not Achaean: Studniczka relying mainly on the absence of fibulae. 2. Dörpfeld discusses numerous passages from ancient authors and inscriptions in support of his view that the cella of the ancient temple of Athene on the Acropolis was rebuilt, without the peristyle, after the Persian wars and was still standing alongside the Erechtheion in the time of Pausanias and afterwards: plan. 3. Petersen curtly demolishes the whole of Dörpfeld's argument. 4. Wolters on two funeral stele, found near Larissa and now in the museum there. 5. Milchhöfer on minor antiquities and inscriptions in Attica, excluding Athens: to be continued. 6. Winter on an archaic funeral stele with reliefs, found at Lampræ in Attica and now in Athens: plate. 7. Reich on a marble relief of Heracles and the lion, also from Lampræ; and a terra-cotta relief with the same subject, from the Acropolis: plate. 8. Stschoukareff on a very fragmentary legal inscription on the Acropolis.—C. T.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1887: part 2. Rome.

1. De Rossi and Helbig on the life and work of Wilhelm Henzen. 2. Tommaseo-Crudeli on malaria in ancient and modern Rome; suggesting that various deaths commonly attributed to poisoning were really caused by malaria. 3. Studniczka on an archaic bronze statue of a boy, probably a victor in the games, in the Palazzo Sciarra-Colonna; mentioned by Winckelmann and others, but never before published: three plates. 4. Mau on the excavation of a large house in the eighth region at Pompei, already partly excavated in 1769: plan. 5. Lignana doubts the authenticity of the inscription on a fibula from Praeneste discussed by Dümmler in the last part.—C. T.

Revue Archéologique. May—June, 1887. Paris.

1. M. Heuzey on the Persian robe termed *καυδάκης*, illustrated by a Chaldaean statue, a Babylonian statuette, a piece of Egyptian textile fabric, all in the Louvre, and other objects: two plates. 2. M. Mowat on Oscan inscriptions combined with types of coins; showing that the reliefs on the terra-cotta stele with an Oscan inscription, found near Capua and now in the British Museum, represent an As and a Quincussis of about 275 B.C.: plate. 3. M. Deloche

on signet rings of the Merovingian period : continued. 4. Dr. Néroutos-Bey on Greek inscriptions from Alexandria : continued. 5. M. Guillemaud on Gaulish inscriptions : continued—the inscription of Novara. 6. Discovery of Gallo-Roman pottery at Mantoche by M. Viot. 7. M. Leval publishes a Byzantine inscription at Constantinople.—C. T.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. May—November, 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. MM. Cousin and Deschamps publish inscriptions fixing the site of Cys in Caria. 2. M. Duchesne on the epitaph of Macedonios, bishop of Apollonias in Lydia in 366 A.D., lately found there by M. Fontrier. 3. M. Paris publishes inscriptions from the temple of Athene Cranaia at Elatea, seven of which relate to the indemnity paid by Phocis to Delphi after the Sacred War. 4. M. Clerc publishes inscriptions from the valley of the Maeander. 5. M. Holleaux publishes two archaic bronze statuettes found by him within the temple of Apollo Ptoos, one representing an 'Apollo' and the other a warrior : two plates. There is a third plate of three archaic bronze lions, but no corresponding text. 6. M. Foucart publishes an inscription from Halos in Phthiotis recording enfranchisements of slaves during two years, and thereby determines the calendar in use there. 7. MM. Deschamps and Cousin publish seven inscriptions from the temple of Zeus Panamaros near Stratoniceia in Caria, recording the services rendered by members of one family in the age of the Antonines. 8. MM. Radet and Lechat on the sites of *Æge*, *Attaleia* and *Sandena*.—C. T.

Gazette Archéologique. 1887. Nos. 3, 4.

1. Henzey on certain engraved seals and cylinders principally from Aidin, which he localises to a school of art in Asia Minor. 3. Odobesco on a silver dish and a stone sarcophagus both with subjects in relief, found in Roumania : two plates. 4. Reinach on a bust of an athlete in the Louvre, formerly in the Villa Borghese, and which he compares to the athletic statues of Pythagoras of Rhegium : plate. 5. Reinach publishes a head of black granite in the Constantinople Museum, which is possibly a portrait-head in the guise of Bacchus Ammon : plate. 6. Collignon notes the fragments of an archaic marble male figure recently acquired by the Louvre : plate.—C. S.

The same. 1887. Nos. 5, 6.

2. Pottier : a series of most important vases, hitherto unedited, of the Musée de Ravestein at Brussels : two plates. 4. Bapst : discovery of tombs at Siverskata in the Caucasus, with objects dating from about 100 B.C. : plate : (to be continued). 4. Mowat : bronze statuette (a portrait) from Bayonne, in the Musée St. Germain : plate. 5. Reinach on the apotheosis of Homer ; the so-called figure of Melpomene is more probably Mnemosyne ; the muse descending the mountain, not Thalia, but Kalliope : plate. 7. Danicourt : an intaglio representing a Gaulish portrait head.

C. S.

Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική. 1887. Part I. Athens.

1. Philios : an honorary decree (fifty-three lines) from Eleusis. 2. Staes : decree of Megarians (ninety-six lines) as to land in dispute between Korinth and Epidaurus. 3. Palaiologos Georgiou : three inscriptions from the Akropolis of Athens. 4. Staes : an archaic statuette of Athena recently found near the Erechtheion, consisting of two vertical sections in thin strips of sphurelaton which has been gilt : plate. 5. Sophokles : an archaic torso and part of a horseman, in marble, from Athens : two plates. 6. The same : the archaic bronze portrait-head recently found on the Akropolis : plate. 7. Stschoukareff : decree from Akropolis honouring Kanephori, with an Archon's

name hitherto unknown. 8. Koumanoudes : an inscribed marble disk from the Olympieion at Athens : and a decree from Thisbè recording the erection of a statue of Caracalla there. 9. The same : three unpublished dikast tickets.—C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

Part 5. (i.) *Compte Rendu* of discoveries in Rome : specially notable are—an inscription recording that in the last century of the Republic the magistri and flamines restored one of the sacella compitalia on the Oppian hill—and a *favissa* found on the Esquiline : a deposit of exvotos in terra-cotta representing all parts of the human body, and probably dedicated to a healing deity. Gatti's conjecture that this deity was Minerva Medica is strengthened by the discovery of a terra-cotta head of Minerva, and a votive dedication to her, published by Visconti in (ii.) : plate. He also describes a marble statue probably of the same deity, which has long lain unnoticed in a convent garden hard by. The same writer notes the discovery of a mosaic near Rome representing Pluto in the act of seizing Proserpine. Part 6. (i.) *Compte Rendu* continued : chiefly Roman inscriptions. (ii.) Visconti continues description of Esquiline find ; terra-cotta statuettes of Greek style : assigns date broadly from last century of Republic to end of first century A.D. : double plate. Near the Porta Portese has been found a Græco-Roman marble basin, carved with a combat of Lapiths and Centaurs : and some late marble heads, including one of the Knidian Venus ; near the piazza Cenci, part of a large marble relief representing a sacrificial scene ; and a fragment with the figure of Psyche : and near the Porta S. Lorenzo a fine marble sarcophagus with the vengeance of Medea, resembling the one in the Mantua Museum. Part 7 (i.) Gatti : front of a marble sarcophagus found near porta Maggiore, with relief of betrayal of Judas, about fourth century A.D. (ii.) Borsari : a slab of marble with rare treatment of a subject from the myth of Pentheus and the Maenads : plate. (iii.) *Compte Rendu* continued : *inter alia*, a marble base with metrical Greek inscription dedicating a statuette of Herakles : an account of the tombs found by Sir S. Lumley in the Vigna Jacobini.—C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

PART 8. (I.) Visconti describes the find last month at the Via del Colosseo of two large fragments of a marble frieze 1·5 metre high, which must have represented a large Gigantomachia. The one fragment, 1·24 metre long, includes an Artemis (like the Versailles type, but *winged*), a draped female in a pensive attitude, (Gaia?), and part of a male figure, armed with a hammer : this attribute, and a pair of pincers at his feet mark him as Hephaistos. The other fragment, 1·24 metre long, is more damaged : on it are part of a female (Hera?, as in the Pergamene frieze) hurling a spear or torch in violent movement, and another (whose face is the only one preserved) rushing with a torch resting against her arm, wings on her forehead, and winged endromides, apparently an Erinyes. The style appears to be that of the best Græco-Roman period, probably of Augustan age. Visconti suggests that the frieze may have formed part of the Templum Telluris dedicated originally A. U. C. 484, and probably rebuilt by Augustus : plate in phototype. (II.) Gatti, *compte rendu* : among sculptures, part of a sarcophagus, with a Genius leaning on a reversed torch ; and a small military trophy of dresses and arms with an elephant's head in the middle, and over all a lionskin on which a nude

figure is seated. Notes by late Prof. Henzen on certain inscriptions from the Via Saluria referring to the functionaries of the 'Factio Prætoriana' of the Circus. Near Frascati a tomb has been found with a skeleton having around the neck a circlet of bronze inscribed thus: 'Tene me et rebeca me Aproniano Palatino ad Mappa (m) Aurea (m) in Abentino quia fugi.' It had evidently belonged to a slave who had escaped and been recaptured. De Rossi compares it with a bulla found in 1884, which bore this inscription: 'Fugitivus so revoca me in Abentino in domu Potiti ne ad Decianus.'—C. S.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. 1887. Vol. VIII. No. 1.

1. A. S. Murray: the Capua rhyton (in the British Museum) in form of sphinx: the subject painted above the sphinx is not 'Triton, Nikè, and other figures,' but Kekrops and Nikè, with Erichthonios, Pandrosos and another of the Kekropidae: two plates. 2. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner complete their numismatic commentary on Pausanias: five plates. 3. Paton: excavations in Caria: woodcuts. 4. E. L. Hicks: study on history of Iasos. 5. E. Gardner: two Naucratis vases: plate. 6. Leaf discusses the trial scene in *Iliad* xviii., arguing that it gives a form of procedure 'the oldest in chronology, though not in evolution' known to us. 7. Ridgeway: the Homeric talent, its origin, value, and affinities. 8. E. Gardner: recently discovered archaic sculptures. 10. The same: a late elegiac Greek inscription of sixteen lines, epitaph of a lady Areskoussa: from Boiai in Lakonia. 11. A. H. Smith: notes on a tour in Asia Minor: with map. 12. Note by J. E. Harrison giving from Prof. Milani the provenance of two vases published *ante* vol. vii. pl. lxx. p. 198, fig. 2.

Excavations in Greece 1886-7. Sculpture and Epigraphy 1886-7. *Reviews*: 'Naukratis, the third memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund'; Reinach's 'Conseils aux Voyageurs arch. en Grèce'; Furtwaengler's vase catalogue of Berlin. The second editions of Klein's 'Meistersignaturen' and 'Euphronios'; Winter's 'Jüngerer attischen Vasen'; Morgenthau's 'Zusammenhang der Bilder auf Gr. Vasen'; Schneider's 'Troische Sagenkreise'; Vogel's 'Scenen Euripideischer Tragödien in Gr. Vasengemälden'; Meisterhans' 'Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften'; Collitz' 'Sammlung der Gr. Dialekt-Inschriften'; Loewy, 'Inscr. Gr. Bildhauer'; Reinach's 'Traité d'Épigr. grecque'; Latyshev's 'Inscriptiones Tyrae, Olbiae, Chers. Taur., &c.'; Busolt's 'Gr. Gesch.' vol. i.; Duncker's 'History of Greece', vols. i. ii.; Holm's 'Gr. Gesch.' vol. i.; Head's 'Historia Numorum'; Beloch's 'Bevölkerung der Gr.-röm. Welt.'

There is some talk of bringing out this journal in a new dress after this year, the plates and text being combined in one cover, of imperial 8vo., about the dimensions e.g. of the *Atti dei Lincei*. An index will also be issued to the first eight volumes.—C. S.

Journal of the British and American Archaeological Society of Rome. Vol. I. 3. Rome 1887.

1. Sir J. Lumley: Inaugural address. 2. Nichols: remarks on the Regia. 3. Miles: Gavinana in Tuscany. 4. Searle: the site of the villa of Catullus at Tivoli. 5. Pullan: recent archaeological discoveries in Rome.—C. S.

The Numismatic Chronicle. 1887. Parts I and II. vol vii. third series.) 1. Rev. W. Greenwell. 'The Electrum Coinage of Cyzicus.' A monograph of 125 pages, giving a full list of the coins with discussions on the types, &c. It is accompanied by six autotype plates of the principal specimens. 2. J. N. Svoronos. 'The inscription ΤΙΣΤΡΟΙ on Coins of Gortyna.' The writer discusses the views of Von Sallet and Wroth as to the meaning of this inscription. He thinks that it may be a synonym for 'Gortynians,' thus indicating the issuers of the coin.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. March-April. 1887. W. Froehner.—Obituary notice of Baron Lucien de Hirsch, the well-known collector of Greek coins (died 6 April, 1887).—A. de Belfort. 'Trouvaille de Reims.' On a hoard of 753 Roman silver coins recently discovered in, or near, Reims. The earliest piece is of Vespasian (or Titus?); the latest, of Alexander Severus (A.D. 79—A.D. 227).—List of prices realised at the Ponton d'Amécourt sale of Roman gold coins in April, 1887.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. May-June. 1887. E. Revillout. 'Second Letter to M. Lenormant on Egyptian Coins.' 'On the rate of Interest'.—A. Oreschnikow. 'A Coin with the monogram BAM.' (BAMI.) According to the writer, struck by Mithradates Eupator at Pergamon.—E. Demole. 'The history of an imitated Aureus of the Emperor Quintillus.' Now in the possession of the Baron Viry-Cohendier. Reverse type = 'fides militum'.—A. de Belfort. 'An imitated Aureus of the Emperor Postumus.' Reverse type = 'aequitas'.—Notices of recent sales.—Finds of Coins.

Revue Numismatique. 3rd. series, vol. v. Deuxième trimestre. 1887. Baron L. de Hirsch, 'Orontobates or Rhontopates.' On coins of Orontobates the Carian Satrap. The correct reading is shown to be 'Rhontopates,' or, possibly, 'Orhontopates,' and not 'Othontopates'.—T. Reinach. 'Mithradates Eupator and his father.' On the tetradrachms bearing the name of Mithradates Philopator Philadelphus (Euergetes,) the father of Mithradates the great (Eupator).—E. Babelon. 'Marcus Annus Afrinus, Governor of Galatia.' On coins &c. of Iconium and Pessinus with his name.—Obituary notice of Baron L. de Hirsch.—Review of Head's *Historia Numorum*.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Journal of Philology. Emendationes Propertianae. By A. E. Housman—Miscellanea Critica. By A. Palmer.—Life and Poems of Juvenal. By H. Nettleship.—Notes in Latin Lexicography. By H. Nettleship.—The Title of the second book of Nonius. By H. Nettleship.—On the fragments of the Latin Hexameter Poem contained in the Herculean Papyrus. By R. Ellis.—Kin and Custom. By F. B. Jevons.—Pausan. viii 16 § 5. By John E. B. Mayor.—Seneca Ep. 19 § 3. By John E. B. Mayor.—Ovid, *Met.* iv

139—141. By John E. B. Mayor.—A lost Edition of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. By John Masson.—Lucretiana. By J. P. Postgate.—The Pugio Fidei. By S. M. Schiller-Szinessy.—A Roman MS. of the Culex. By Robinson Ellis.—Aristarchos' Reading and Interpretation of *Iliad*, v 358—9. By W. Leaf.—Servius on *Aeneid*, ix 289. By H. Nettleship.

Hermathena, no. xiii. Dublin. Notes on Tyrrell's Correspondence of Cicero vol. ii (Robinson Ellis);

a paper on the origin of the Greek Interjections (T. Maguire), [in the reference to *King Lear* Kent is written by mistake for Gloster]; Translation as a Fine Art (R. Y. Tyrrell) with illustrations from Jebb and Verrall; Miscellanea (T. Maguire) contains *Choeph.* 526—549, 691, 2, *Agam.* 612, Herodotus on the vote of the Spartan kings, Catull. lxxi 21, 2, Claud. in *Ruf.* i 65, 6, *Nupt. Hon.* 106—8, Lucan ii 21—8, vi 471, 2, Tac. *Hist.* i 25, *Aen.* iv 436 vii 116—120, 580—600, ix 138—140 (we prefer the usual rendering: how does Dr. M. explain *non?*) x 185—193, 96—8, xi 266—8, xii 52, 3, *Phaedo* 101 D. *Oed. R.* 27; Verrall's *Septem* (J. J. Beare); Paronomasia in Pindar (J. B. Bury); Roman Account books (L. C. Purser); *Sept e Theb.* (A. W. Verrall) in reference to criticisms by J. J. Beare and R. Y. Tyrrell; Miscellanea critica (A. Palmer) contains Aesch. *Pers.* 164, *Eum.* 272, Eur. *Hel.* 302, 441, 510, 775, 974, 1203, 1271, 1286, 1421, 1505, 1590, 1597, *H. F.* 257, 936, 1351, *Cycl.* 95, 343, *El.* 687, *Andr.* 346, 746, 962, 990, 1065, *Ranac.* 19, 269, 465, 1298, *Plant.* *Pers.* 94, 358, 651, *Rud.* 298, 315, 383, 556, 1368, *Stich.* 538, 549, 669, *Truc.* 746, 989, Cic. *Fam.* iii i. 1, Hor. *Sat.* i. 2. 25, Juv. viii. 237; Greek Geometry from Thales to Euclid no. 7 (G. J. Allmann.)

Transactions of the American Philological Association. vol. xvii. Boston, 1887. The articles bearing on Classical philology are: Phonetic Law (a criticism of the neo-grammarians doctrine) by F. B. Tarbell; Notes on Homeric Zoology (a criticism of Buchholz) by Julius Sachs; *Rud. Seneca De Beneficiis* by H. N. Fowler; the Dative Case in Sophocles by B. W. Wells. The Appendix contains abstracts of papers read before the Association at their meeting in July 1886.

Athenaeum: 25 June; a letter from Mr. Bent on Discoveries in Thasos, a second appears in the 23 July number. 23 July; reviews of Casagrandi's *Storia e Archeologia Romana* (L. Calpurnius Piso, the Abbecciation of Dioctetian, Tacitus &c.). 30 July; notice of Loofs' *Leontius von Byzanz*: Notes from Crete by J. Hirst. 13 August; review of Antike Denkmäler herausg. v. K. Deutschen Archäologischen Institut.

Academy: 25 June; a letter from J. O. Westwood on the Cod. Amiatinus. 2 July; notices of classical books (Adam's *Plato's Apology*, Holden's *Cyropaedia*, Seeck's *die Quellen der Odyssee*, &c.). 9 July, a letter from G. Hirschfeld on the Inscriptions from Naukratis: the correspondence is continued by him and by E. A. Gardner, W. M. Flinders Petrie and A. H. Savce in the Nos. for 16 July, 6 August, 20 August, 27 August, 16 July; an obituary of A. F. Pott. 13 August; letter on a Roman (?) pavement (with inscription) recently found in London by W. Thompson Watkin (a further letter by J. Hoskyns-Abraham on 3 September). 3 September; a letter on a Roman Inscription found at Chester by W. T. Watkin. 10 September; notice of H. Nettleship's Passages for translation into Latin Prose.

Blätter f. d. Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen xxiii Heft 4. L. Dittmeyer, The spuriousness of Aristot. h. an. bk ix (part 3, conclusion).—Reviews (1) of H. Nohl, Cic. oratt. sel. pt. III (Leipzig, Freytag, 1886), by C. Hammer; (2) of Verg. *Aen.* vii—xii. With Germ. notes by Th. Ladewig. 8th ed. by C. Schafer (Berlin, Weidmann, 1886) and (3) of Verg. *Aen.* schol. in usum ed. W. Klouček (Leipzig) Freytag, Schenk's texts), both by Hans Kern; (4) of H. v. Arnim's Eurip. Med. with Germ. notes.

2nd ed. (Berlin, Weidmann, 1886; a reconstruction of Schöne's ed.), by H. Stadtmüller.

Heft 5 and 6. Joh. Proschberger, Studies in Horace I (c. II 12).—C. Meiser, a contribution to the solution of the Katharsis question (the Aristotelian *κάθαρσις τῶν παθῶν*).—Jos. Sarreiter, Regulations for teaching in Austrian gymnasia I. 'Latin and Greek.' Reviews (1) of the Caesar lexicons of Meusel and Menge—Preuss, by G. Landgraf; (2) of Cic. de or., with Germ. notes by K. W. Piderit. 6th ed. by O. Harnecker. Bk. I (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886) by Ed. Stroebel, who complains that Wilkins's ed. has been neglected; (3) and (4) of Em. Reichenhart 'Der Infinitiv bei Lucretius' (acta semin. Erlang. iv 457—526. 1886; compared with Krause 'de Vergiliis usurpatione inf. Halle 1878,' Joh. Schmidt 'de usu inf. ap. Lucanum, Valerium, Silium. Halle 1881,' J. Senger über den Inf. bei Catull, Tibull, Propert. Speier 1886.' Progr.), and L. Schwabe's Catullus (Berl. Weidmann, 1886) by F. Schaeffer, who is surprised that in 1107 Schwabe has not accepted Munro's simple emendation 'est furis;' (5) of 'Carlo Tanzi. Studio sulla cronologia dei libri variarum di Cassiodorio Senatore. Trieste. 1886.' pp. 364; (6) of Hom. Od. ed. P. Cauer. 2 vols. (Leipzig, Freytag. 1886—7 Schenk's texts), by M. Seibel; (7) of Soph. O. T. with Germ. notes by J. Holub, Paderborn, Schöningh) by Weeklein (worthless); (8) of Aristot. met. recogn. W. Christ (Lips. biblioth. Teubner) by Ch. Wirth; (9) of 'Flavii Josephi opera edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese. II (ant. vi—x). Berol. Weidmann 1885.' 4to. pp. 392, by Joh. Muhl (Niese, known by his Homeric researches, was won to the study of oriental Hellenism by the late Alf. v. Gutschmid), (10) of 'B. Gerathewohl, Die Reiter und die Rittercenturien zur Zeit der röm. Republik (München, Ackermann, 1886) by M. Rottmanner; (11) of Kiepert 'Atlas der alten Welt. 19 Aufl.' New bearb. v. Carl Wolf. Weimar. 1884' by G. Briedermann. Bavarian Programmes (of Gymnasias and Latin schools) of the school-year 1884—5, reviewed by Renn: (1) Ph. Weber, die Absichtssätze bei Aristoteles (Speier); (2) Fr. Krebs, zur Rektion der Kasus in der späteren historischen Gracität (Regensburg); (3) Frid. Altinger, de rhetoricis in orationes Thucydeas scholias (München); (4) Max Müller, Oppian's d. J. Gedicht v. d. Jagd. 1 Buch metrisch übers. u. mit. erklär. Bemerkungen versehen (Amberg.); (5) H. W. Reich, die Beweisführung des Aeschines in seiner Rede gegen Ktesiphon. II Hälfte (Nürnberg); (6) Joh. Muhl, Plutarchische Studien (Angsburg); (7) Andr. Neumeyer, Aratus von Sikyon. I (Neustadt a. d. H.); (8) Ludw. Büchner, die Besiedlung der Küsten des Pontos Euxeiños durch die Milesier. I (Kempten); (9) J. M. Miller, die Beleuchtung im Altertum. I D.B. bei den Griechen (Aschaffenburg. To be followed next year by 'Lighting among the Romans').

Heft 7. Rem. Stölze, 'Italian Gymnasias and Lyceas' (the classical teaching unsatisfactory, completed in Heft 8)—Joh. Gerstenecker 'on the meaning of *si quis, si qui*' (criticising Wölfflin in Sitzungsber. d. Akad. zu München 1886 p. 268). Favorable reviews (1) of J. H. Schmalz, Sall. Jug.² with German notes by Albr. Köhler; (2) of O. Brosin, Verg. *Aen.* iv—vi (Gotha, Perthes, 1886) with German notes (ibid.) by Ed. Gross; (3) of Kiessling, Hor. od. epod. with German notes (Berlin, Weidmann) by Joh. Proschberger; (4) of Schepps, Priscillian, ein neu aufgefunden lat. Schriftsteller des 4 Jahrh. (Würzburg, Stuber, 1886) by B. Sepp, who mentions, after Prof. Guerrino Amelli, of the Ambrosian library, a 10th century MS. of the chapter library at Novara, containing valuable documents relating to Monophysitism, to the councils of Constantinople (448),

Ephesus (449), Chalcedon (451). The collection was made by Dionysius Exiguus between 530 and 535; (5) of Frid. Schubert, *Soph. Trach.* (Schenkl's texts, Leipzig, Freytag, 1886), and (6) of N. Wecklein, *Soph. O. Tr.* with German notes (München, Lindauer, 1886). Both reviewed by K. Metzger; (7) of Guil. Studemund, *Anecdota varia Graeca musica metrica* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1886, pp. 313. 10 M.) by H. Stradt Müller, with many conjectures; (8) of Gustav Gilbert, *Handbuch d. griech. Staatsalterthümer*. II (Leipzig, Teubner, 1885, pp. viii 426) by J. Melber, who adds to both volumes inscriptions and monographs which had escaped Gilbert, or which have appeared since his work. Melber protests against the harsh censure of Wilamowitz—Möllerndorf (in *Hermes*).

Heft 8. Ed. Kurtz, on the *Philogelos* of Hierokles (ed. Eberhard, 1869).—Reviews by C. W. (1) of Baehrens, 'fragmenta poetarum Romanorum' (Teubner). The verses 'de cereo' (Aug. c. D. xv 22, cf. A. Röslér, *Prudentius*. Freib. i. B. 1886, p. 71 n. 2) have escaped the editor; (2) of Buecheler's ed. of Jahn's *Persius*, *Juvenalis*, *Sulpicia*.—Reviews by M. Seibel (1) *Hom. II.* with German notes by Ameis. I 3 (bk. vii-ix). Edited by Hentze. 3rd ed. and 'Anhang zu Hom. II. III Heft. Erläuterungen zu vii-ix' by Hentze. 2nd ed. remodelled (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886-7); (2) H. Guhrner, *Musikgeschichtliches aus Homer*. I (Lauban Gymnasium 1886).—Review by W. Zipperer of Karl Krumbacher, *Griechische Reise*. Berlin, Hettler, pp. xli, 390. 7 M.—Bavarian Programmes (1884-5) reviewed by Renn. (1) Alois Patin, *Heraklits Einheitslehre die Grundlage seines Systems und der Anfang seines 'Buchs (München)*; (2) L. Leipert, *Beiträge zu Horaz (Straubing)*; (3) Jos. Firtner, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Sulpicius Severus (Landshut)*; (4) Joh. Praun, *Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitouus mit eingehender Darstellung der Substantivsätze (Bamberg)*; (5) H. Ulrich, *Vitruvii copia verborum part. II (Schwabach)*; (6) Gust Landgraf, *die Vita Alexandri des Archiepiscopos Leo. I Theil die Nektanebussage I 1-14 (first published from mss. at Bamberg and München, with an essay on the romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes); (7) Incerti auctoris liber de origine gentis Romanae (fragm.): ad fidem cod. Brux. qui exstat unicus denuo recensuit Bernh. Sepp. (The ms. was rediscovered by Mommsen; it is important for new readings in Cicero, Sallust, Livy, and has 'Ciceronian synonyma' not printed in Orelli); (8) Sex. Propertii *elegiarum librum primum commentariis grammaticis instruxit F. J. Hildenbrand (Frankenthal)*; (9) Jos. Wisn Meyer, *die durch Scholien nicht erklärten kritischen Zeichen der Iliadhandschrift Venetus A.**

Mnemosyne. Nova series. xv (1887), pt. 3. Lugd. Bat. Brill. *Minutiae epigraphicae*. Scr. H. J. Polak. Greek inscriptions I. from Kertsch (Rhein. Mus. xli Heft 3). II. The Brough inscription, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, which Polak reads thus:

ἐκδεκτὴ τις ἰδὼν τύμβον σκηφθέντ' ὑπὸ μοίρης
Ἐρμὴ Κομμαγενὴν ἔπος φρασάτω τόδ' ὀδεῖταις
,,Χαῖρε σὺ, παῖ, παρ' ἐμοῦ, κείνερ θνητὸν βίον ἔρπες
ῥέοντα"—ἔττης γάρ—μερόπων ἐπὶ Κυμνερῶν γῆς,
οὐ φθίσαι· ἐβίως γάρ, ὃ παῖς Ἐρμῆς, ἀν' (ὕψιστ) ἰ."

III. Epitaph of Amorgos (Rhein. Mus. xxxix Heft 4). iv. Inscriptions presented to the Leyden Museum by R. J. Lennep, Dutch consul at Smyrna, and lately discussed by the septuagenarian C. Leemans. The biblical names *Τρόφιμος*, *Ἀφφία*: the Platonic *περίπτωμα*, and curses directed against the violation

of tombs, are of special interest. V. Two inscriptions from the *Philologische Wochenschrift*, no. 33, 1886; the first had already been published in 1885. VI. Lead tablets from Dodona (Neue Jahrb., 1883, 305-360). VII. Two inscriptions in Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, the former (no. 349) founding at Teos a school for boys and girls (this is compared with Plin. ep. iv. 13, and with the famous essay of Musonius Stob. ecl., ed. Wachsmuth, II 235-9, in which several corrections are suggested).—Frontin, aq. 128 (J. v. d. Vliet reads *ad <com> modum* and *<tam> quam privata*).—Ad. A. Gellii *Noctes Atticae* ser. I. C. G. Boot. The Franeker MS., used by Io. Tornaesius for his ed. 1592, has been examined throughout. In xvii 2 16 Hertz has neglected the certain conjecture of J. Fr. Gronov *vecatur* for *versatur*. E. H. Eldikii *epistola critica* (obs. iii 4) de *Anthologia Latina*. Twenty years ago Boot read a notice of Erik Huibert van Eldik to the royal academy and printed some of his notes on Martial. The present letter was addressed to the younger P. Burman in 1773.—Οὐδὲν, *δραστήριον, ῥῶγες*, ser. A. E. J. Holwerda (illustrates Homer from Schliemann's discoveries at Tiryns).—De Tibulli *elegiarum structura*, ser. H. T. Karsten. *Pars altera*.—Hor. epod. 2 37 (P. J. Scriverius reads *Roma quas for quas amor*).—Euripidea, ser. H. Kuissner. Med. 109, read *δυσκαταπαύστοις*. 128 οὐδὲν *βέβαιον* (an anapaest). 345 εἰκὸς δὲ *σφιν*. Other conjectures in Andr. 347. Ale. 330. Hec. 620, 854, 1187. Hel. 923.—Epigraphica, ser. H. v. Herwerden (in *Bullet. de Correspond. Hell.*, 1886, p. 112 ver. 12 read *περιήγιστον*; *ibid* p. 179 for *ΑΠΙΔΕ* read *ἀνδρὶ δέ*.—Liviana, ser. J. v. d. Vliet.—Aristoph. eq. 895. L. v. Leeuwen reads *τότ' ἄξιον* for *τὸν ἄξιον*.—Quaestiones Graecae, ser. I. M. J. Valetton. II. De ostracismo.—Thuc. iv 63 2 for *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔγαν*. L. v. Leeuwen reads *<ἔσται> ἄγων, ἀλλα καὶ*.

Zeitschrift für oesterr. Gymnasien, xxxviii (1887) Heft 3. Homerisches, Von J. La Roche.—Review by H. Schenkl of 'Die Sprichwörterammlung des Maximus Planude, erläutert von E. Kurtz, Leipzig, 1886.' R. Rappold's review of *Ov. met.* with German notes by H. Magnus. II, III (bks. vi-xv).—Reviews by J. Golling (1) of Nepos. *Pars altera*. Ed. G. Genios. Paderborn und Münster. 1885; (2) of M. Heynacher 'Was ergibt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauch Cäsars im b. G. für die Behandlung der lat. Syntax in der Schule. 2 verm. Aufl. Berlin, Weidmann. 1886.'—Aug. Scheindler's severe review of Ignaz Prammer *Sall. Catil. Ing.* Wien, Holder, 1886.—A. Goldbacher's review of Knoell's *Eugippius*. Vienna, Gerold. 1885-6. (The life of S. Severin appears in a greatly improved text).—Review of Baumeister's *Denkmäler (Art. Kadmos to Peiraios)*.—K. Schenkl, *The Gymnasia of Servia* (27 subjects, chiefly natural science, no Greek, Latin 4 hours a week only in the highest three classes). They correspond to the German *Realschulen*.—Review by Fr. Stolz, of 'A. Vaníček, *Biographische Skizze von Dr. Glaser*, Wien. Karl Cöten. 1885. pp. iv 66.' V. was professor of Comparative Philology at Prag. At the end of the book are reprinted 'Recollections of Dr. August Schleicher' from his pen.

Heft 4. Perikles and Thukydides, by J. v. Pflugk-Hartung.—J. Zahlleisch on Aristot. 1135 b 3-8. 1033 b 21 sqq.—1040 14-32.—Review by H. Schenkl of 'Anecdota varia Graeca et Latina. Ediderunt Rud. Schoell et Guil. Studemund. Vol. I. *Anecdota varia Graeca, musica metrica grammatica*, ed. Guil. Studemund. Berlin, Weidmann. 1886.' 8vo. pp. VI 313. 10 M.—Review by F. Hanna of *Hor. sat.* with German notes by Adolf Kießling. Berlin,

Weidmann. 1886. pp. xxiv 240.—Review by E. Reisch of 'Albert Müller, Lehrbuch der griechischen Bühnenalterthümer. Freiburg i. B. 1866. Mohr' (Hermann's Lehrbuch III 2).—Reviews by A. Bauer (1) of 'G. Egelhaaf: Analekten zur Geschichte. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1866' pp. 284. M. 5.40 (on the military services of Perikles, the battle of Chaironeia, Capua's defection to Hannibal, Hannibal's letter to the Rhodians); (2) of 'A. Fokke. Rettungen des Alkibiades II. Emden, Haynel. 1886.' pp. viii, 112; (3) of 'F. F. Schulz: Quibus ex fontibus fluxerunt Agidis, Cleomenis, Arati vitae Plutarchae. Berol. Hadk. 1886. pp. VIII, 57; (4) of 'C. Peter: Zeittafeln der griechischen Geschichte. 6 verb. Aufl. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1886.' pp. IV, 166.—K. Schenkl, The Gymnasia of Serbia. A commission has issued two reports, three members recommending the separation of the Gymnasium from the Realschule, two retaining the single Gymnasium; both admit Greek and allow more time for Latin.—Review by H.S. Sedlmayer of Margoliouth, Aesch. Agam.—Review by J. Golling of 'Emendationen zu Verg. Aen. I. IV. Von Dr. G. Heidtmann. Coblenz, N. Groos. 1885.' pp. viii, 10.

Heft 5. Explanation of Plat. soph. 253^d e by Dr. F. Lukas.—Review by A. Kornitzer of 'Demosth. ex rec. G. Dindorfii vol. I ed. iv correctior curante F. Blass. Leipzig, Teubner. 1885.'—Review by A. Zingerle of Baehrens, 'Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum. Lips. Teubner. 1886.'—Review by E. Reisch of 'Frédéric Plessis, études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies. Paris, Hachette. 1884.'—Review by R. Bischofsky of Schmidt's abridged text of Q. Curtius (Schenkl's texts).—Review by T. Wildauer of 'Die Psychologie der Stoa von Dr. Ludwig Stein. I. Metaphysisch anthropologischer Theil. Berlin, Calvary. 1886.' pp. 216.—Qualifications for the office of teacher in the Prussian higher schools (regulation of 5 Feb. 1887). Notice of 'The Classical Review. No. I.'

Zeitschr. f. oesterr. Gymn. xxxviii (1887). Heft 6.

M. Iskrzycki, 'scholia to the Odyssey' (additions and various readings from the Cracow ms. J of the Orl., compared with Dindorf's edition).—J. Mähly, 'Vergilian doubts.'—Ign. Prammer, 'on Tacitus' (1) *silentium uastum* in Tac. Agr. 38. h. iii 13. an. iv 50 borrowed from Liv. x 34 § 6. (2) Tac. an. i 3 (the portrait of Agrippa Postumus) *rudem sane bonarum artium et robore corporis stolidi ferocem, nullius tamen flagitii compertum*, borrowed from Livy's account of young Titus Manlius vii 4 § 4 *nullius probi compertum*. 5 § 2 *capit consilium rudis quidem iulque agrestis animi*. § 6 *iuvenem stolidi ferocem uiribus suis*. (3) the rule of Tacitus and Sallust (Oros. vii 10 § 4) to omit the numbers slain or taken in battles, allows of some exceptions Agr. 37. an. iv 73. xiv 37. h. ii 17.—Favorable reviews (1) by Carl Ziwsa of Platonis Symposion erkl. v. Arn. Hug. 2nd ed. Leipzig 1884. pp. lxxvii, 232. 3 M. (2) by F. Lanczizky, of Platonis Meno et Euthyphro. Incerti scriptoris Theages Erastae Hipparchus. Recensuit prolegomenis et commentariis instruxit Ad. R. Fritzsche. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1885. pp. 347 (founded on Stallbaum's ed. of 1836, but practically a new work); (3) by Franz Slameczka of Ausgew. Reden des Demosthenes erkl. v. A. Westernmann. vol. ii (de cor. c. Lept.). 6th. ed. by E. Rosenberg. Berlin, Weidmann. 1885; (4) (5) and (6) by A. Kornitzer of Cic. or. sel. scholarum in usum ed. Herm. Nohl (p. R. Am. Leipzig, Freytag 1884; in Q. Caec. div., in Verr. iv, v, ibid. 1885); Ciceros Divin. in Q. Caecilius hrsg. v. Fr. Richter. 2ed. by A. Eberhard. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884; Ciceros Rede für Archias, hrsg. v.

Fr. Richter u. A. Eberhard. 3rd. ed. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884; (7) by M. Petschenig of M. Iuniani Iustini epitoma hist. Phil. Pompei Trogi ex rec. Fr. Ruehl. Accedunt prologi in Pompeium Trogum ab A. Gutschmid recensiti. Leipzig, Teubner (bibliotheca) pp. lxii, 315. The name of the epitomator, 'M. Iunianus Iustinus' is preserved only by C. cod. Casinensis (now Laurentianus) saec. xi, to which Ruehl, in the books for which it exists, attributes the highest authority; (8) by J. Ptasechnik of Kiepert's Atlas antiquus. 8th. ed. Berlin, Reimer. This has now an index of names, which may be had separately, Pr. 1 M, 20 Pf.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.—No. 11 (16 March): H. Jordan, *Der Tempel der Vesta* (G. Zippel), describes completely and pronounces carefully on the excavations carried on since 1874.—R. Linde, *de recessionibus Apollonii Rhodii* (Al. Rzach), unduly minimises the differences between our text and the *ῥοικδοσις* mentioned in the Scholia.—*Scholion Hephaestionica*, ed. W. Hoerschelmann (H. Reimann), relieves Schol. B so completely from the disorder introduced by Turnebus and Gaisford that it may be called an Editio princeps.—A. Sperling, *Apion der Grammatiker*, scientifically and with much objectivity white-washes this persecutor of the Jews.—M. Gitlbauer, *Streifzüge V* (E. Wolff) ascribes great importance to β MSS. of Caesar, exaggerates somewhat and is not always convincing.

No. 12 (23 March)—B. Lorenz, *Taube im Alterthum* (M. C. P. Schmidt): table of contents. Fr. Studniczka *Geschichte der griech. Tracht* (P. Weizsäcker) a most instructive work, with a polemic against Helbig, and deserving the attention of all archaeologists.—Fr. Cauer *Aeneassage* (E. Baehrens), industrious but unsatisfactory alike in methods and results.—Th. Oesterley *Humor b. Horaz* (G. Faltn) doomed to speedy oblivion.—J. Winkestejn *de fontibus libri de viris illustribus* (Th. Opitz) thorough and industrious.

No. 13 (30 March)—*Inschriften griech. Bildhauer* von Em. Loewy (P. Weizsäcker), a most important, excellent and careful work.—K. Brugmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik i.* (F. Holthausen), stimulating and illuminating; includes an introduction on the original Indo-germanic home and the pronunciation of the various alphabets, and affords fresh evidence of the connection between Latin and Celtic.—*Homer* ed. Christ (A. Rzach), is an edition full of good work, but the commentary is so condensed as to be misleading, and contains many errors.—E. Wolff *Taciti Hist. i. ii.* (J. Müller), uniform with Nipperdey's *Annals*, but more of a school-book.—F. Devantier *Lat. Relativum in der Verschränkung* (Zillgenz), a clear and exhaustive discussion of a difficult point in Latin syntax.

No. 14 (6 April)—H. Osthoff *Neueste Sprachforschung* (H. Ziemer) a complete refutation of Collitz.—C. Maurer *de aris Graecorum pluribusdeis in commune positis* (H. Gloë) important.—*Homer* ed. W. Christ (A. Rezach): a list of the errors in the commentary.—*Aristotelis de Anima* recogn. G. Biehl (Dembowski) possesses much merit.—A. Kalkmann *Pausanias* (H. Dütschke) learned and lively.

No. 15 (13 April)—Roscher, *Lexikon d. Mythologie* 9 and 10 (A. Zinzow), thorough and careful.—H. Hersel, *Auctor libelli περί ὕψους* (Br. Keil), a careful examination of the quotations contained in the *περί ὕψους*.—*Persii, Juvenalis, Sulpiciae Sat. Recog.* Jahn-Bücheler (A. Weidner): Bücheler has made important alterations, many happy emendations and corrections in punctuation, but of course the edition is not final.

No. 16 (20 April).—*Demosthenes' Philipp.* v. Rehdantz-Blass (W. Nitsche): Blass has made a number of improvements but the edition remains practically the same.—*Euripides' Medea*, v. H. v. Arnim (Th. Barthold): practically a new edition, so little is left of Schöne's work: in criticism Arnim is weak, otherwise fair.—H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu Caesar 3 Lfg.* (A. Neitzert) much inferior to Meusel's lexicon.—*Ellendt's Lat. Gramm.* v. Seyffert-Fries (Zillgenz): this the thirtieth edition brings the book up to modern requirements.

No. 17 (27 April).—J. v. T. Baunack, *Studien d. griech. u. arisch. Sprachen i.* (O. Immisch): grammatical, etymological and epigraphic studies which show much insight and astonishing labour.—H. Berger, *Erkunde der Griechen* (J. Patsch), the most important contribution to the study of ancient geography that has been made for years. Stahl, *Quaestiones ad Thucyd. pertinent.* (S. Widmann): in effect a new book and full of proofs of the science, learning and judgment of the author.—Ihne, *Römische Geschichte* vi. (G. Faltin): Ihne differs from Niebuhr's estimate of Caesar, but does not believe that empire was the plan which dominated his whole life; is less severe on Cicero than is Mommsen; this vol. no more attractive to the general public than the previous five.—*Plantus*, Ritschl recog. Goetz (Anspach); Goetz much more conservative in the text than Ritschl.—Merguet, *Lexikon zu Caesar* Lfg. 4-6 (E. Wolff), behind the times.—G. Schepss, *Ältesten Evangelienhandschriften der Würzburger Universitätsbibliothek* (Stangl) new and good MS. material for reconstructing the Itala.

No. 18 (4 May).—F. Müller *Zu den Reden bei Thukydides* (S. Widmann) stimulating.—*Heberden Euripides Medea* (Th. Barthold) makes no claims to originality.—*Dionysii Halic. antiqu. Roman.* ex. rec. A. Kiessling et V. Pron (K. Jaedby) unsatisfactory.—C. J. Rochel *de allocutionis usu apud Thucydidem, Xenophontem al.* (Br. Keil) alike unscientific and unmethodical.—A. Gerber et A. Greef *Lexicon Taciteum VI.* (E. Wolff) an excellent contribution both to the explanation of Tacitus and to the history of Latin.

No. 19 (11 May).—*Denkmäler d. klass. Altertums* 21—33 (P. Weizsäcker), the good far outweighs the bad.—H. Hesbrecht *de sacerdotii apud Graecos emptione* (P. Stengel) a thorough piece of work.—*Euripides Medea* von S. Mehler (Th. Barthold): the review discusses many passages, but does not estimate the value of the edition.—J. Kohn *Echtheit der Tetralogien des Antiphon* (H. Lewy) cautious and generally sound.—C. Th. Michaelis *de Plutarchi codice Marciano* 386 (Br. Keil) valuable.—*Corippi quae supersunt.* rec. M. Petschenig (M. Manitius) contains many happy emendations.—H. Meyer *Schriften zur Kunst* (H. Blümner) contains little that is new to the archaeologist.

No. 20 (18 May).—W. Richter *Handel u. Verkehr der Völker des Mittelmeers* (H. Blümner) readable and sound.—*Euripides' Herakliden* von W. Bauer, 2 Aufl. von N. Wecklein (H. Gloël) an excellent school edition.—*Carmina figurata Graeca* ed. C. Haerberlin, and M. Rannow, *Studia Theocritea* (G. Knaack) the former contains some interesting discoveries and many untenable hypotheses; the latter is a sober, solid piece of work.—A. Gereke *Chryssippea* (F. Susmihl) a good contribution towards a complete collection of the fragments of Chrysippus.—Fr. Knoke *Germanicus in Deutschland* (G. Andresen) somewhat too long and somewhat uneven, but most important.

The *Philologischer Anzeiger*, vol. xvii, parts 2 and 3. 18. Ettore di Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, fasc. i, ii, *abacus—ab actis* (rev.

by J. Schmidt). The author's object is to supply a systematic explanatory index to all points of Roman antiquities contained in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, with references to the actual inscriptions. The work includes names of places, but excludes those of persons, with the exception of the Emperors and their families. It would be premature to express an opinion upon the value of the work on the strength of the first fifty-four pages only.

Greek Authors.—19. Arthur Ludwig, *Aristarch's homerische textkritik nach den fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt* (L. Cohn). An instructive contribution to recent Homeric literature. 20. August Fick, *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt* (H. F. Müller). The reviewer finds no ground for believing in the existence of an Aeolian Iliad. 21.

A. Brand, *über die ausdrücke der zeit bei Homer* (L. Schmidt). Mainly on ἡδῆς and its various epithets in Homer. 22. K. Sander, *über die zeiteintheilung in den homerischen gedichten* (L. Schmidt). On the duration of the events described in the Iliad and Odyssey. 23. R. Linde, *de diversis recensitionibus Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon* (R. Volkmann). A somewhat diffuse but interesting dissertation. The author attacks many of Merkel's views, and finally disposes of that scholar's hypothesis of a triple recension of the Argonautica. 24. J. Pomtow, *Poetae lyrici Graeci minores* (E. von Leutsch). 25.

B. L. Gildersleeve, *The Olympian and Pythian Odes, with an introductory Essay*, &c. (O. Crusius). Well suited for beginners. The editor mainly confines himself to the avowed object of recording the most important results of German research; and this he does with an enthusiasm and skill that deserve recognition. The introductory essays are clear, concise and stimulating; but too little is said on the life of Pindar and too much on the metrical schemes of J. H. H. Schmidt. The use of Greek coins for the embellishment of a popular edition of an author like Pindar merits approval; but the reproduction of the Eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia is on far too small a scale. 26. M. Rannow, *Studia Theocritea* (C. Haerberlin). Part i, on the date of Idylls xvi, xvii, xiv, xv. Part ii is devoted to proving that Theocritus did not imitate Callimachus. 27. S. Reiter, *De syllabarum in trisemum longitudinem productarum usu Aeschyleo et Sophocleo* (K. Hildebrandt). Cap. 1, summary of the opinions of Hermann, Apel, Boeckh, Feussner, Bellermand, Rossbach and Westphal, J. H. H. Schmidt, M. Schmidt and Christ on the instances in choral metres of a long syllable being specially lengthened so as to be metrically equivalent to three or more short syllables. Cap. 2, numerous examples from Aeschylus and Sophocles, showing that, in certain circumstances, a lengthened syllable equivalent to 'three times' —, antistrophically corresponds to —, or — — —, or — — —. Cap. 3, on the use of a long syllable as equivalent to 'four times' especially in the ionic and dochmiac metres of Aeschylus and Sophocles. Cap. 4, on the circumstances in which the lengthened syllable equivalent to 'three times' is used by these poets. The writer shows a thorough familiarity with the theory of Greek metre and the criticism and exegesis of the tragic poets. Chap. 2 is of special importance in showing that Aeschylus and Sophocles are far less corrupt than is generally supposed, and that it is high time to restore to those authors a purer text by the removal of modern 'emendations.' The whole work is worthy of careful study by all who are interested in the criticism of the tragic poets. 28.

T. Zielinski, *Die märchenkomödie in Athen* (W. Uckermann). The author regards the Birds of

Aristophanes as the only surviving example of this kind of comedy; but finds traces of ancient folklore in other plays. Some of these fragmentary allusions may be illustrated by the folklore of modern Greece (e.g. Vesp. 794 ff. by Hahn ii 85.) 20. C. F. Müller, *Ignatii Diaconi tetrasticha iambica* 53, versus in Adamum 143. *De Ignatii metrica arte vita scriptis disputatio* (F. Hanssen). The introduction confirms the view that Ignatius Diaconus flourished in the first half of the ninth century. It is to be regretted that the editor has not used any fresh manuscript material: and that he has not discussed the prosody of his author, with a view to showing *inter alia* whether the *Anacreontea* ascribed to him are genuine or not. 30. A. Bauer, *Thukydides und H. Müller-Strübing. Ein beitrag zur geschichte der philologischen methode*. An interesting defence of Thucydides against the attacks of Müller-Strübing, and a well-timed protest against the destructive criticism, of which it is a typical example. 31. A. Kalkmann, *Pausanias der Perieget* (K. Seeliger). An elaborate review extending over 14 pp., closing with the statement of the reviewer's opinion that, though the materials collected in Kalkmann's treatise will be gratefully used by all who are engaged in research on the subject of Pausanias, yet his views as to the sources from which Pausanias derived his information can only be regarded with grave mistrust. 32 and 33. J. Kohm, *ein beitrag zur frage über die echtheit der tetralogien des redners Antiphon*, in two parts (F. Blass). The author rightly maintains the genuineness of the speeches, though he does not pay sufficient attention to differences of style between the tetralogies and the other speeches (e.g. in the use of particles). 34. H. Buermann, *Die handschriftliche überlieferung des Isokrates*; ii, *Der Urbrian und seine verwandtschaft* (F. Blass). The first part of Buermann's treatise on the MSS of Isocrates was reviewed in *Phil. Anz.* in 1885, p. 410. The present deals with the *codex Urbrianus* alone, and with the textual inferences to be drawn from the corrections in that MS. The reviewer looks forward with interest to the publication of the rest of the treatise.

Latin Authors.—35. I. L. Ussing, *T. Macci Plauti comediae*; vol. v, *Persam, Rudentem, Stichum, Trinumnum, Truculentum continens*. Ussing's edition of Plautus is now complete, with the exception of the *Cistellaria* and *Casina*. In spite of the good service done by the editor in certain passages of the text, the present volume, as a whole, is not calculated to change the unfavourable opinion which German scholars have formed respecting the parts already published. Commentaries like those of Brix on the *Miles Gloriosus* and of Lorenz on the *Pseudolus* contain more trustworthy information on the language of Plautus than is to be found in all the eighteen plays of Ussing's edition. The reviewer, who does not sign his name, illustrates his remarks by an examination of some passages of the *Persa*. 36. J. S. Speijer, *Lance Satyra* (C. Haeblerlin). A pamphlet containing (1) a discussion of the meaning of *Orcus*; (2) a new explanation of Hor. Sat. i 5, 87, 'oppidulum versu quod dicere non est'; (3) emendations on Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Livy, Tacitus; (4) grammatical observations on *est* = *edit*, and on *pecunia*, *cupere aliquid* and the *nominativus praedicativus*. (1) *Orcus*, according to Speijer, is always the god of the underworld, never the underworld itself; if so, in Aen. iv 242, 'animas ille evocat Orcus,' we must not only understand *ab*, but also alter *evocat* into *avocat*. The reviewer suggests that *Orcus* may here be a 'dativus ethicus': 'er ruft dem Orcus die seelen fort.' (2) The *oppidulum* is identified as *Vēnisiā*, not as *Equum Tutium* (*Schol. ad loc.*), which does not lie on the route described, and can be got into hexameter verse (by separating its

two parts and eliding the last syllable). (3) Of the emendations, the reviewer approves Aen. iv 610, 'et Dirae ultrices fidei' (for *d Di*).

Greek History, &c.—37. Arnold Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, vol. i and ii of revised ed. 1885-6 (H. Landwehr). The first vol. of this admirable work was revised by Schaefer himself, the second by one of the late Professor's pupils, M. Hoffmann, with the help of Usener and Kirchhoff. The evidence of inscriptions discovered since 1856-8 has been taken into account in the new edition, and the whole work has been very carefully revised; vol. i includes a lithograph of a bust of Dem.; vol. ii, one of the statue at Knole; to vol. iii Michaelis contributes an excursus on the extant portraits of Dem. 38. Boeckh, *Die staatshaushaltung der Athener*, ed. 3, in two vols.; with notes by M. Fränkel (H. Landwehr). A worthy edition of a great work. 39. F. B. Jevons, *History of Greek Literature from the earliest period to the death of Demosthenes* (K. Sittl). A work that shows familiarity with the most recent literature of the subject, as well as critical ability and common sense. The reviewer makes a few corrections on points of detail; and suggests that, in a future edition the introductory chapter might, with advantage, be expanded.

Roman History, &c. 40 and 41. K. W. Nitsch, *Geschichte der römischen republik; nach dessen hinterlassenen papieren und vorlesungen herausgegeben von dr. G. Thouret*. 2 vols. (M. Zoeller.) A work which, in spite of certain faults, can be thoroughly recommended to all who are engaged in the special study of Roman History. 42. E. Marks, *de alis, quales in exercitu Romano tempore liberae reipublicae fuerint* (A. Bauer). Shews that, down to the time of the Marsic war, the word *alis* is used of the mixed contingent of cavalry and infantry furnished by the allies of Rome (*ala sociorum*); and afterwards, of cavalry alone (*reiter-ala*). 43. M. Siebourg, *de Sulevis Campestribus Patris dissertatio epigraphica* (Joh. Schmidt). Conspectus of inscriptions referring to the *Suleviae* (p. 1-16), with two appendices on the *dea Sules* (?) of Bath and on the *Silvanæ* (16-20), the *Campestres* (20-25); the *Patii*, *Fatae* (25-28). The cult of the *Suleviae* and the *Matres* (or *Matronae*) prevailed in Celtic and German districts during the first three centuries of the Roman Empire; but (as the reviewer shows) was not confined to 'homines humiliores.' Similarly in the case of the *Campestres*. On the *Fatae* the writer ought to have noticed the evidence derived from coins. 44. H. Maué, *die vereine der fabri, centonarii und dendrophori im römischen reich* (E. Herzog). A valuable pamphlet on some of the guilds of the Roman empire. 45. P. Willems, *les élections municipales à Pompéi* (E. Herzog). A model of antiquarian and epigraphic research, in the form of a popular lecture by the learned author of the 'Droit public romain,' and 'Le sénat de la république.'

Travel.—46. M. Toussaint, *Von klassischen stätten. Reiserinnerungen und geschichtliche rückblicke*; and 47. Ed. Engel, *Griechische frühlingstage* (L. Bornemann). Toussaint's pamphlet contains an account of a visit to Rome, Naples, Paestum and Selinus, and a voyage from Messina to Athens; for many of his details, he professes to be mainly indebted to the works of Gregorovius, Dörpfeld, Michaelis and Ross. Engel's book is distinctly original. It is inspired throughout by a warm appreciation of the modern inhabitants of Greece; and in spite of certain faults of style and taste, is thoroughly interesting, especially its account of the author's tour in the Peloponnesus. He is evidently more at home in the life and language of the modern Greeks, than in matters connected with Greek Archaeology.

The number closes with bibliography (p. 203-15); items of philological news (216-22); and contents of philological periodicals (222-7).

Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* xxix, Nos. I. and II., pp. 1-59.
—R. Lenz.—On the physiology and history of the palatals, dealing especially with the palatalisation of gutturals in the Romance languages; pp. 59-124—
F. Solmsen.—Sigma in combination with nasals and liquids in Greek—an elaborate collection of instances illustrating the laws given by Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 45, 55. (i) I.-E. *s* + nasal and nasal + *s* medially between vowels in Urigriech. are assimilated to double nasal; the double nasal is kept in Lesbian and Thessalian, elsewhere simplified with lengthening of preceding vowel, e.g. I.-E. *hsmé*, Lesb. *ἄμμε* Att. *ἡμείς*. (ii) Nasal + *σ* + consonant loses nasal, without lengthening preceding vowel—e.g. *δεσπότης* = *δεσπο-πότης* (except *n* + *s* + *i*, which becomes *νσσ* and falls under iii.) (iii) Nasal + *σ* initially and medially between vowels, if originating within the limits of Greek, in Argive, Cretan, Arcadian, and Thessalian remains unchanged; elsewhere nasal lost and preceding vowel becomes in Lesbian an *i*-diphthong, elsewhere is lengthened. Continuation promised.—
Pp. 124-152—J. Wackernagel.—Miscellen (i) liquids and nasals + *σ*; in accented syllables combination remains, *mutatis mutandis* (*ῥπος* = *ῥπος*), in unaccented *σ* lost with lengthening of vowel (*οῦπα*). (ii) Attic contraction of *εφο*, *οφα*, contracted when accent comes later (*νομηρία*), uncontracted under the accent (*νέος*). *πλεόν* (neut. sing.) in Aristoph—in other forms *πλείον(ων)*. *πλείον* being properisopomenon had main accent on *ε*; *ι* consequently dropped; but in *πλείωνες* bore main accent. (iii) *ἐκαστος* from an earlier *ἐκάστis* (each for himself, cf. quisque) gen. **ἐκάστο ἐκάστου*, whence *ἐκαστος*. (iv) *αἶδω*—Orig. aor. *ἄ-Fe-Fō-on* = *ἄFeidon* as *ἔ-Fe-Fē-on* = *ἔειπον* (K. Z. xxv. 306), which has passed to a pres. stem (cf. *ἄ-υδῆ*). Pp. 152-176—P. Kretschmer—The Corinthian Vase Inscriptions. Pp. 176-188—F. Burg. On the relation of writing to speech. Pp. 188-192—K. Krumbacher. Supplementary to previous article (xxvii. 484) on the history of the Greek language. P. 192—Wilbrandt connects cella (**cēla*) with *cēra*.

Revue de Linguistique et de Philologie Comparée. Paris. 15 Janvier, 1887.—A. Hovelacque and Jean Kirste review favourably *La Linguistique Evolutionniste* of Paul Regnaud, who follows the older philologists in all save theory of *guna* or vowel-intensification. He regards *a* as the original vowel and refers all consonants save liquids and nasals to a whistling and explosive group. Primitive roots were few in number, simple in meaning. Raoul De La Grasserie continues his inquiry into the distinctions of number in the Indo-European languages. Paul Regnaud complains of L. Havet for neglecting 'linguistique' in his recent *Abrégé de Grammaire latine*, and discusses the reserve of modern philology in the matter of first principles.—15 Avril, 1887.—C. A. Pietremont begins an account of the *Patois Briard*. Paul Regnaud reviews Darmesteter's *La Vie des Mots*—doubts the plan of sketching the philosophy of language from a single speech—says that among forces which preserve language the author has forgotten the grammarians—thinks the dark ages caused decay of literary Latin, not its crystallisation—doubts author's distinction between German as rich in compounds, and Romance as rich in derivatives—

considers the work valuable in details and a contribution to the history of French, if not a contribution to the philosophy of Language.

Theologischer Literaturzeitung, herausg. von Ad. Harnack u. E. Schürer. The following articles may be noticed. 26 Mar.: Gwynn, On a Syriac MS. belonging to the collection of Archbishop Ussher (Nestle). Dr. Gwynn shows that Ussher's MS., which was supposed to contain a Syriac translation of the whole of the N. T., still exists in Trin. Coll. Dublin, but that it contains only those portions of the N. T. which are wanting in the Peshito—John viii., the four smaller Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse. It is important for the textual criticism of these portions. 9 April: Ueber ein in Deutschland bisher unbekannte Fälschung des Simonides (A. Harnack). Dräseke published in the *Zeitschrift für Wissensch. Theologie*, 1887, pt. 2, the conclusion of the *Shepherd* of Hermas in Greek, which has hitherto been wanting. This is taken from a collection of Greek treatises edited by Simonides, published by David Nutt, London, 1859. Dräseke treats this document with much more respect than it deserves, and even Hilgenfeld thinks that it may contain something of value. Harnack thinks it well, therefore, at once to point out the marks of forgery which present themselves to him. This he does with great force and very convincingly—Jahn, *Alb. Des Heil. Eustathius Beurtheilung des Origenes betreffend die Auffassung der Wahrsagerin I. Kön. [Sam.] 28* (F. H. Reusch). This treatise is one of the scanty monuments of the obscure beginning of the attack on Origen, though in itself, in relation to the exegetical problem, of no importance. The text both of Eustathius and of Origen's Homily which he criticises has hitherto rested mainly on the *Editio Princeps* of Leo Allazzi, taken from a very faulty Vatican MS. Thanks are due to Jahn for his edition, which is founded upon all the printed editions, and on the Codex Monacensis Graecus 331, now used for the first time. Jahn's text of the Homily of Origen certainly renders all previous texts obsolete, but he has taken far too little pains in the emendation of Origen from the citations of Eustathius; he has done very little for the explanation of the matter which he has edited; he has given no index of any kind; and his introduction contains nothing of any value which is not found in Huet and Delarue.

Theologisch Tijdschrift, xxi. 3. May 1887. Dr. Völter in a long article called Ignatius-Peregrinus, written in German, endeavours to shew (1) that the Ignatian Epistles are all with the exception of the Epistle to the Romans 'genuine'; (2) that the 'genuine' six are really the work of Lucian and Peregrinus, and identical with the epistles ascribed to him by Lucian in C. 41 (*φασί δὲ πᾶσαι σχεδὸν ταῖς ἐνδόξοις πόλεσιν ἐπιστολὰς διαπέμψαι αὐτόν, διαθήκας τινὰς καὶ παρανέσεις καὶ νόμους*); (3) that with the expulsion of Peregrinus from the Church they lost their popularity, and were afterwards at the time of the Montanist movement re-edited with the name of Ignatius substituted for that of Peregrinus by a diascene who also wrote the Epistle to the Romans, in which the author is first represented as a Bishop, and introduced into the remaining epistles 'die Vorstellung das der Briefschreiber auf dem Transport nach Rom sich befinde'. Review: Die synoptischen evangelien nach der Form ihres inhaltes von C. Holsten by Dr. W. C. van Manen. (Favourable.)

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Ainger* (A. C.) and *Windle* (H. G.) Eton Latin Grammar. Part I. Accidence and Syntax Rules for use in Preparatory Schools. 8vo. 106 pp. London, Murray. 2s.
- Caesar*. Gallic War. Book VII. Edited for the use of Schools by Rev. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. With Notes and Vocabulary. 18mo. 116 pp. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Cicero*. Cato Maior sive de Senectute, edited by E. W. Howson. 12mo. xvi. 79 pp. London. Rivington. 2s.
- Speeches against Catiline. With Introduction and Notes by E. A. Upcott. 8vo. 120 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Clyde* (J.) The Modern Latin Grammar for the use of Schools. Composed with constant reference to the Elucidation of the Latin Element in English. Part I. Elementary. 16mo. 166 pp. Edinburgh. Oliver and Boyd. 2s.
- Compton* (W. C.) Rudiments of Attic Construction and Idiom: an Introduction to Greek Syntax for beginners who have acquired some knowledge of Latin. 12mo. viii. 87 pp. Cambridge. Deighton Bell. 3s.
- Herodotus*. Book IX. Ch. I.-LXXXIX. (Plataea). With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Schueckburgh. Cr. 8vo. 220 pp. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 3s. 6d.
- Holden* (F. T.) Triperitita. 3rd Series. A Course of easy Latin Exercises for Preparatory Schools, arranged to suit the threefold division of the year. 12mo. 246 pp. London. Rivington. 3s.
- Horwell* (H. W.) The right method of studying the Greek and Latin Classics: The Chancellor's Essay, 1887. 8vo. 22 pp. Oxford. Blackwell. 1s.
- Ironside* (G.) Rudimenta analytica. Part I. The simple sentence. An easy and carefully-graduated First Latin Course, containing Grammar, Word-building, Exercises, and Vocabulary for the use of Schools. Cr. 8vo. x. 255 pp. London. Simpkin. 3s. 6d.
- Kymerley* (H. W. S.) Latin Exercises. Second Edition, with Vocabulary arranged in alphabetical order of the more elementary portions of the work entitled Latin Prose Composition. 8vo. 160 pp. London. Relfe. 2s.
- Lucani* Pharsalia, edited with English Notes by C. E. Haskins, with an Introduction by W. E. Heitland. 8vo. cxxx. 393 pp. London. Bell. 14s.
- Morice* (F. D.) Greek Passages adapted for practice in Unseen Translation for Middle and Higher Forms of School. 12mo. vi. 124 pp. London. Rivington. 2s. 6d.
- Nettleship* (H.) Passages for translation into Latin Prose. With an Introduction. Cr. 8vo. vi. 135 pp. London. Bell. 3s.
- Ovid*. Easy selections from Ovid in Elegiac Verse. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises in Latin Verse Composition by H. Wilkinson. 18mo. 116 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Stories from the Metamorphoses. Selected and Edited with Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary by J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. 18mo. 90 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Plato*. Meno, with Introduction and Notes by St. George Stock. 12mo. London. Frowde. 2s. 6d.
- Rauclinson* (G.) Ancient History. Cr. 8vo. xiii. 352 pp. London. Deacon. 7s. 6d.
- Stedman* (A. M. M.) Easy Latin Passages for Unseen Translation. 12mo. 72 pp. London. Bell. 1s. 6d.
- Virgil*. Aeneid I. edited with Introduction and Notes by C. S. Jerram. 16mo. xxxix. 43 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Adams* (W.) De ablativi absoluti apud Q. Curtium Rufum usu. 8vo. 56 pp. Arnberg. Stein. 1 Mk.
- Aristophanis* comoediae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico et scholiis graecis instruxit F. H. M. Blaydes. Pars VII. Acharnenses. 8vo. xx. 509 pp. Halle. Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 10 Mk. (I.-VII. 50 Mk.)
- Aristotelis* opera omnia quae extant, brevi paraphrasi et litterae perpetuo inhaerente expositione illustrata a Silv. Mauro, S. J. Tom. IV. De Anima, Parva Naturalia, Metaphysica. Ed. Aug. Bringmann, S. J. Roy. 8vo. 656 pp. Paris. Lethielleux.
- Ausfeld* (R.) De libro *περί τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλευθερον* qui inter Philonis Alexandrini opera fertur. 8vo. 58 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 60.
- Ausone, Sidoine Apollinaire et Fortunat*. Oeuvres complètes, traduites par E. F. Corpet, E. Barret, Ch. Nisard. Avec le texte latin. Roy. 8vo. v. 817 pp. Paris. Didot. 10 francs.
- Bechtel* (F.) Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts. 4to. viii. 154 pp. mit 5 Tafeln. Göttingen. Dieterich. 8 Mk.
- Belsheim* (J.) Codex (F) Corbiensis sive quatuor evangelia ante Hieronymum latine translata. E codice membranaceo quinto vel sexto seculo, ut videtur, scripto qui in Bibl. Nat. Paris. asservatur, nunc primum ed. J. B. 8vo. viii. 127 pp. Christiania Aschehoug. 3 Mk. 50.
- Blancard* (L.) Sur quelques noms osques d'Espagne et d'Italie. 8vo. 10 pp. Marseilles.
- Théorie de la monnaie romaine au 3^e siècle après J.-C. 8vo. 10 pp. Marseilles.
- Blass* (Fr.) Die attische Beredsamkeit. Abth. 1. Von Gorgias bis zu Lysias. 2. Aufl. 8vo. vii. 648 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 14 Mk.
- Naturalismus und Materialismus in Griechenland in Platon's Zeit. 8vo. 19 pp. Kiel. Univ. Buchh. 1 Mk.
- Böcker* (F.) Damme als der mutmassliche Schauplatz der Varusschlacht, sowie der Kämpfe bei den Pontes longi im Jahre 15 und der Römer mit den Germanen am Agri-varierwalle im Jahre 16. 8vo. 72 pp. 2 pl. Cologne. Bachem. 1 Mk. 75.
- Brunk* (A.) De excerptis *περί τοῦ τῶν ἡρώων καθ' Ὀμηρον* *βίον* ab Athenaeo servatis. 8vo. 39 pp. Greifswald. 75 Pf.
- Caesaris* (C.) Julii, de bello gallico commentarii VII. cum commentario VIII A. Hirtii. Rec. H. Walther. 8vo. xx. 188 pp. Paderborn. F. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Cicero*. Discours contre Verrès. Seconde action. Livre 6. De Signis. Texte Latin publié d'après les travaux les plus récents, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, une introduction, un index et des cartes par E. Thomas. 8vo. 140 pp. 2 maps. Paris. Hachette. 4 frs.
- Traité des devoirs (livre 1^{er}). Traduction française précédée d'une introduction sur la morale stoïcienne et la morale de Cicéron par E. Maillet. 12mo. xli. 74 pp. Paris. Belin.
- Tusculanarum disputationum ad M. Brutum libri V. Erklärt von Dr. G. Fischer. Bd. 2. Buch III.-V. 8^{te} Aufl. von G. Sorof. 8vo. 172 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 50.
- Collignon* (M.) Le combat d'Erechthée et d'Immarados sur une tessère grecque en plomb. 8vo.

- 9 pp. (*extr. Mém. de la Soc. Nat. des Antiquaires de France*).
- Commentationes philologiae in honorem sodalitiū philologorum Gryphiswaldensis secundum lustrum scripserunt veteres sodales.* 8vo. 67 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Croiset (A. et M.) Histoire de la littérature grecque.* Vol. I. Homère—La poésie cyclopie—Hésiode par M. Croiset. 8vo. xxxvi. 604 pp. Paris. Thorin. 8 frs.
- Cucuel (C.) Quid sibi cui Cratylus inscribitur proposuerit Plato.* 8vo. 64 pp. Paris. Leroux. 3 frs. 50 c.
- *Essai sur la langue et le style de l'orateur Antiphon.* 8vo. ix. 145 pp. Paris. Leroux. 5 frs.
- Curtius (E.) Griechische Geschichte.* 1. Bd. Bis zum Beginne der Perserkriege, 6. verbesserte Aufl. 8vo. vii. 701 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 8 Mk.
- Demosthenis de Corona Oratio in usum scholarum iterum editit J. H. Lipsius.* 8vo. vi. 120 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Didascalia CCCXVIII patrum pseudepigrapha e graecis codicibus recensuit P. Batiffol, Coptico contulit H. Hyvernati.* 8vo. 21 pp. Paris. Leroux. 3 frs.
- Didymi de Aristarcha Odysseae recensione reliquiarum Supplementum ab A. Ludwig editum.* 4to. 10 pp. Königsberg. Schubert und Seidel. 20 Pf.
- Dieltz (Th.) Homerische Formenlehre.* Ein Repetitionsbuch für Gymnasien. 8vo. 24 pp. Altenburg. Pierer. 40 Pf.
- Eckstein (F. A.) Lateinischer und griechischer Unterricht.* Mit einem Vorwort von Dr. W. Schrader. Herausgeg. von Dr. H. Heyden. 8vo. xiii. 501 pp. Leipzig. Fues. 9 Mk.
- Edet (G.) Histoire sommaire de la littérature grecque.* 16mo. viii. 368 pp. Paris. Hachette. 3 frs.
- Feilchenfeld (A.) De Vergili Bucolicorum temporibus.* 8vo. 48 pp. Berlin. Mayer und Müller.
- Fischer (W.) Gegen den Homer Kultus in unseren Schulen.* 8vo. 24 pp. Leipzig. Siegmund und Volkening. 60 Pf.
- Flach (J.) Der Hellenismus der Zukunft.* 12mo. 51 pp. Leipzig. Friedrich. 1 Mk.
- *Klassizismus oder Materialismus.* 2. Ausg. 8vo. 49 pp. Leipzig. Reissner. 1 Mk.
- Fritzsche (H.) Kurzgefasste griechische Schulgrammatik.* Teil 2. Syntax. 8vo. vii. 50 pp. Hannover. Norddeutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 60 Pf.
- Führer durch die Ruinen von Pergamon.* Hrsg. von der Generalverwaltung der königl. Museum zu Berlin. 12mo. 27 pp. and 2 Pläne and 1 Abbildung. Berlin. Spemann. 60 Pf.
- Geppert (P.) Zum Monumentum Ancyranum.* 4to. 18 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Goetz (G.) De Sisebuti carmine.* 4to. 8 pp. Jena. Neuenhahn. 50 Pf.
- Goetzler (L.) De Polybi elocutione.* 8vo. iv. 47 pp. Würzburg. Stahel. 1 Mk. 60.
- Greilich. Dionysius Halicarnassensis quibus potissimum ex artibus metaphoricis ductis in scriptis rhetoricis usus sit.* 8vo. 46 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 1 Mk.
- Grimmell (B.) De republicae Platonis compositione et unitate.* 8vo. 102 pp. Berlin. Weber. 1 Mk. 20.
- Grollmus (M.) De M. Tullio Cicerone poeta.* I. De inscriptionibus, de argumentis, de temporibus singulorum carminum. 8vo. 56 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 50.
- Guérin. Etude sur Juvénal avec une traduction complète en vers français et des notes.* 8vo. 347 pp. Paris. Cerf. 7 fr. 50 c.
- Haake (A.) Die Gesellschaftslehre der Stoiker.* 4to. 22 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1 Mk. 60.
- Hofter (E.) Die Erbtöchter nach attischem Recht.* 8vo. x. 91 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Hartmann (L. M.) De exilio apud Romanos inde ab initio bellorum civilium usque ad Severi Alexandri principatum.* 8vo. 63 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20.
- Heidenhain (F.) Die Arten der Tragoedie bei Aristoteles.* II. III. 4to. 40 pp. Berlin. Mayer et Müller. 1 Mk.
- Holbig (W.) Das homerische Epos, aus den Denkmälern erläutert. Archaeologische Untersuchungen.* 2. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Mit 2 Tafeln und 163 in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. 8vo. x. 470 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk. 80.
- Herhold (L.) Lateinischer Wort und Gedankenschatz.* Ein Hilfs- und Nachschlagebuch der hauptsächlichsten latein. Ausdrücke, Spruchwörter, Citate, Devisen, Inschriften, etc., nebst deutscher Uebersetzung. 8vo. vii. 280 pp. Hannover. Hahn. 4 Mk.
- Hertzberg (G.) Histoire de la Grèce sous la domination des Romains, traduite de l'allemand sous la direction d'A. Bouché-Leclercq.* Vol. I. 8vo. xvi. 494 pp. Paris. Leroux. 10 frs.
- Hesiod's Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt.* Mit einem Anhang über die Versabzählung in den homerischen Epen. 8vo. 131 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 4 Mk.
- Hildebrandt (A.) Studien auf dem Gebiete der römischen Poesie und Metrik.* I. Vergils Culex. 8vo. vii. 176 pp. 1 pl. Leipzig, Zangenberg und Himly. 2 Mk. 40.
- Homer. Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi.* Band IV. Gesang IX.–XXIV. 6. Aufl. von F. R. Franke. 8vo. 248 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.
- *Ilias.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von K. F. Ameis. 2. Band. 3. Hft. Gesang XIX. XXI. Bearbeitet von C. Hentze. 2. Aufl. 8vo. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- *Dasselbe.* Anhang. 3. Hft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang VIII.–IX. von C. Hentze. 2. Aufl. 1 Mk. 80.
- Horace. Horatius christianus, seu Horatii odae a scandalis expurgatae, a scopulis expeditae et sale christiano conditae, a J. F. Bergier.* 32mo. 164 pp. Salins.
- Jezienicki (M.) Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Platonischen Dialoge Theaetet und Sophistes.* 8vo. 49 pp. Lemberg. Milikowski. 1 Mk. 20.
- Johannson (K. F.) De derivatis verbis contractis linguae graecae quaestiones.* 8vo. iv. 218 pp. Upsala. Akadem. Buchhandlung. 6 Mk.
- Jordan (H.) Die Könige im alten Italien.* Ein Fragment. 8vo. xi. 47 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. Mk. 2.
- Juvenal. Les satires, traduites en vers par P. Ducois. Accompagnées du texte latin et de remarques extraites de la traduction de M. de Silveane (1690).* 8vo. 543 pp. Paris. Perrin. 7 fr. 50 c.
- Kaerst (J.) Forschungen zur Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen.* 8vo. vii. 144 pp. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 1 Mk. 80.
- Kammer (E.) Kritisch-aesthetische Untersuchungen, betr. die Gesänge M, N, Ξ, O, der Ilias.* 8vo. 105 pp. Königsberg. Hartung. 1 Mk. 50.
- Klaueke (P.) Aufgaben zum Uebersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Griechische für obere Klassen.* 8vo. viii. 180 pp. Berlin. W. Weber. 2 Mk. 40.
- Klinke. Quaestiones Aeschinae criticae.* 8vo. 82 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Knaack (Dr. G.) Callimachea.* 4to. 16 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20.
- Koch (E.) Übungsbuch zur griechischen Formenlehre.* Heft I. 8vo. vi. 114 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Korb (F. H.) Lateinische Übungssätze zur Casuslehre aus Q. Curtius Rufus, im Anschlusse an die lateinische Schulgrammatik von K. Schmidt und die Memorabilia Alexandri Magni von K. Schmidt und O. Gehlen zusammengestellt.* 8vo. iv. 42 pp. Prag. Dominicus. 60 Pf.
- Kraft (M.) Zur Wortstellung Vergils.* 4to. 38 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Krebs. Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache.* 6.

- Auflage in vollständiger Umarbeitung der von Altgayer besorgten 5. Ausgabe von J. H. Schmalz. Lief. 4. und 5. Bd. I. pp. 401-744. 8vo. Basel. Schwabe, each 2 Mk.
- (F.) Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gracität. I. 8vo. 24 pp. Munich. Lindauer. 1 Mk.
- Kuhlmann (L.) Quaestiones Sallustianae criticae. 4to. 40 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Livius. Liber V. erklärt von Luterbacher. 8vo. iii. 111 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Luebbert (E.) Commentatio de Pindaricorum carminum compositione ex Nomorum historia illustranda. 4to. 19 pp. Bonn. Cohen. 1 Mk.
- Commentatio de Pindaro dogmatis de migratione animarum cultore. 4to. 21 pp. Bonn. Cohen. 1 Mk.
- Commentatio de Pindari studiis chronologicis 4to. 28 pp. Bonn. Cohen. 1 Mk.
- Lupus (B.) Die Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum. Autorisirte deutsche Bearbeitung der Cavallari-Holmschen Topografia archeologica di Siracusa. 8vo. xii. 343 pp. mit Illustrationen und zwei Karten. Strassburg. Heitz. 10 Mk.
- Majewski (R.) De subjectionis et occupationis formis, quae inveniuntur apud Demosthenem. 8vo. 12 pp. Königsberg. Hartung. 30 Pf.
- Mayer (M.) Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst. Mit 2 Tafeln und in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. 8vo. vi. 414 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 10 Mk.
- Meusel (H.) Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasc. VIII. Roy. 8vo. Pp. 1345-1544. Berlin. Weber. 2 Mk. 40 (Vol. I. epl. 13 Mk. 20).
- Mommson (T.) Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Praepositionen. 2. u. 3. Heft. 8vo. P. 97-288. Frankfurt-Jügel. 4 Mk. 80 (1-3. 7 Mk. 20).
- Mücke (R.) Zu Arrians und Epiktets Sprachgebrauch. 4to. 35 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Platonis dialogi secundum Thrasylli tetralogias dispositi. Post C. F. Hermannum recognovit M. Wohlrab. Vol. I. 12mo. xlii. 551 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Plauti Comediae recensuit, instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit F. Ritschl, sociis operae adsumptis G. Loewe, G. Goetz, F. Schoell. Vol. III. fasc. III. : Rudens. 8vo. xxvi. 188 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Plucanski. Aristotelea de natura astrorum opinio ejusque vices apud philosophos tum antiquos tum medii aevi. 8vo. 145 pp. Paris. Thorin.
- Reiter (A.) De Ammiani Marcellini usu orationis obliquae. 8vo. 78 pp. Amberg. Habel. 1 Mk. 20.
- Reitzenstein (R.) Verrianische Forschungen. 8vo. viii. 116 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Reuchardt (G.) De praepositionum usu apud Ammianum. 8vo. 62 pp. Cöthen. Schettler. 1 Mk.
- Ribbeck (O.) Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. I. Dichtung der Republik. 8vo. vii. 348 pp. Stuttgart. Cotta. 7 Mk.
- Rösch (H.) Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch. Heft. 1. Substantiva. 8vo. 78 pp. Leipzig. Fues. 2 Mk. 40.
- Rosbach (A.) u. Westphal (R.) Theorie der musischen Künste der Hellenen. Bd. 3. Abth. 1. Allgemeine Theorie der griechischen Metrik von R. Westphal u. H. Gleditsch. Nebst einem Nachwort zum 2. Bde. XLVI. 368 pp. 8vo. Leipzig. Teubner. 8 Mk. (I.-III. 1. 22 Mk.).
- Schaezel (L.) Plinius der Jüngere und Cassiodorius Senator. Kritische Beiträge zum 10. Buch der Briefe und zu den Briefen. 4to. 36 pp. Darmstadt. Winter. 80 Pf.
- Schäfer (A.) Demosthenes und seine Zeit. 2nd revised edition. Vol. III. 8vo. x. 496 pp. 1 plate. Leipzig. Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Schimmelpfeng (G.) Oraciones quae sunt in Macartatum (XLIII.) et in Olympiodorum (XLVIII.) et in Laeriti exceptionem (XXXV.) sub Demosthenis nomine traditae num unius ejus denique oratoris esse judicandae sint. 8vo. 68 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Schmidt (F. W.) Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern, nebst e. Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie. Bd. 3. (Zu den kleineren Tragikern, den Adespota, den Komikern und der Anthologie.) 8vo. iii. 236 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 7 Mk. epl. 29 Mk.
- Schneppf (M.) De imitationis ratione quae intercedit inter Heliodorum et Xenophontem Ephesium commentatio. 8vo. 42 pp. Kempten. Kösel. 1 Mk.
- Schutze (W.) Quaestionum Homericarum specimen. 8vo. 55 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk.
- Scribonii Largi compositiones edidit G. Helmreich. 12mo. viii. 123 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Script (O.) De Polybii Olympiadum ratione et de bello punico primo quaestiones chronologicae. 8vo. 50 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Simon (J. A.) Xenophon Studien. I. Zur Entwicklung des Xenophontischen Stils. 4to. 32 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 2 Mk.
- Stütt (K.) Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf Alexander den Grossen. Teil. 3. Mit Generalregister. 8vo. vi. 521. München. Th. Ackermann. 6 Mk. 50. (epl. 17 Mk. 80.)
- Soltan (F.) Zur Erklärung der Sprache des Volkes der Scythen in Anhalt an die über die Sitten und die Sprache dieses Volkes im Geschichtswerke des Herodot gegebenen Mittheilungen. 8vo. 54 pp. Berlin. Stargardt. 1 Mk.
- Susemihl (F.) De Platonis Phaedro et Isocratis contra Sophistas oratione. Adiecta est appendix Aristotelica. 4to. 16 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk. 80.
- Taciti (C.) ab excessu divi Augusti libri. In usum scholarum rec. Prof. M. Githbauer. Book I.-VI. 12mo. viii. 253 pp. Freiburg. Herder. 1 Mk. 20.
- Terence. Comédies. Traduction nouvelle par G. Hinstin avec le texte Latin. Tome I. 16mo. viii. 440 pp. Paris. Lemerre. 5 fros.
- Hecyra. Texte latin. Avec commentaire critique et explicatif par P. Thomas. 8vo. iv. 108 pp. Paris. 3 f. 50 c.
- Theophylacti Sinocatae historiae, ed. Carol. de Boor. 12mo. xiv. 437 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Thomasehik (P.) De Lysiae epithographi authenticis verisimili. 8vo. 44 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 1 Mk.
- Tractatus Harleianus qui dicitur de metris editus a G. Studemund. 4to. 29 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 75 Pf.
- Treuber (O.) Geschichte der Lykier. Mit einer von H. Kiepert entworfenen chromolith. Karte. 8vo. viii. 247 pp. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 5 Mk.
- Vitae sanctorum metricae IX. Ex codicibus Monacensibus, Parisiensibus, Bruxellensibus, Hagensis sac. IX.-XII. ed. G. Harster. 12mo. xvi. 237. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Voigt (M.) Ueber die Staatsrechtliche possessio und den ager compascuus der römischen Republik. (Extr. Abh. d. Kgl. Säch. Ges. d. Wiss.). Roy. 8vo. Pp. 225-272. Leipzig. Hirzel. 2 Mk.
- Völker (E.) Rhintonis fragmenta. 8vo. 49 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 90 Pf.
- Volkmann (W.) Studien Alciphrona. I. De Alciphron comediae imitatore. 8vo. 44 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 1 Mk.
- Wilhelm (F.) De Minucii Felicis Octavio et Tertuliano Apologetico. 8vo. 86 pp.
- Zielinski, Th. Quaestiones comicae. I. Epirhematum. II. De comediae Palaeatticae reliquis. II. De comediae Doricae personis. IV. De Menaechmorum paramythio. V. De Acca Larentia. 8vo. 126 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 2 Mk.